



UNION SOCIETY

Bolton's, &c. June 1834.

It being my fixed opinion, that the decision of Parliament on this bill will decide, not only whether peace shall continue to exist in England, but whether this present sort of government of King, Lords, and Commons, and of Church and State, shall continue to exist. This being my opinion, I shall here go into the subject, and endeavour to make my readers as well acquainted with every part of it as possible; at any rate as well acquainted with it as I am myself.

The bill does not *in words* repeal the compact which was made with the people by the act of the 43. of Elizabeth, but it does it *in silence*, it does it in fact. It takes away wholly from the gentlemen, magistrates of the county; it takes away from the native overseers, and guides and rulers of the parish, who alone can know the parties, and who alone can feel for them as they ought to do; it takes away from all these all power whatsoever. It provides for the erection of immense workhouses by the uniting of many parishes into one for this purpose; it provides for the bringing of utter strangers to be the masters, the managers, and rulers of the poor; it provides for the putting of all these powers into the hands of three persons in London, to be appointed by the Ministers of the day, and removeable at their pleasure. Its main object is, that the poor may receive less than they now receive, though there are other objects

behindhand, which, if this bill be passed, will be developed by degrees.

If the bill itself could leave us in any doubt as to the objects of it, the reports of the hired poor-law commissioners would make us acquainted with what their objects really are. I have not time here to dwell in a particular manner on the cruel regulations which the commissioners recommend; but, as the bill itself is an avowed system which shall be applied in England to be treated as they are in SCOTLAND; so that it is a matter of the greatest importance for us to possess accurate knowledge with regard to the manner in which the poor of Scotland are treated; and it shall be my first business, therefore, to make this matter well understood by every man in England, if I possibly can; and I call upon all men of justice and humanity to assist me in making this information known to the poor of England.

How many times have we heard Mr. HUME boast of the happy state of the working classes in Scotland! How many times heard him boast of the "*high moral state*," the "*feeling of independence*," the "*laudable pride*" of his countrymen! The reader heard Mr. EWING, the member for GLASGOW, say the other day, in his place in Parliament, that the poor of Scotland would spurn; however poor, however destitute, suffering how much soever from want, they would "*spurn parochial relief*."

Now these are the grounds upon which Lord ALTHORP expresses his wish to see the management of the poor in the south, brought to resemble the management of the poor in the north. Therefore it is of the first importance that we ascertain what is the treatment and what the condition of the poor in Scotland; and that we make this known to the poor in England, to all those forming an immense majority of the middle

classes in England, who are filled with horror at the idea of treating their poorer countrymen as slaves, and of stripping them of every right that they have hitherto enjoyed. It is of the first importance that we ascertain the truth as to this matter, and that we leave no doubt whatsoever on the subject.

I shall here insert some papers which will remove every doubt upon the subject, and will, at the same time, develop the real views of those who are pushing forward this bill. But I must first state that of which Mr. HUME appears to have been totally ignorant; namely, that there are poor-laws in Scotland; that there always have been poor-laws in Scotland, from the middle of the sixteenth century, and before the passing of the act of Elizabeth: that, according to these laws, the HERITORS, (a word which the reader will keep in mind), that the *heritors*, or LANDOWNERS, should be assessed for the relief of the poor, so that no person might suffer from want. That the landowners, or heritors, have been continually endeavouring to get rid of these assessments; and, to use the phrase of the hard-hearted ruffians, to render the poor "*independent*" and "*throw them upon their own resources*"; that is to say, to leave them to starve, if not relieved by private charity. This audacious violation of the law has taken place over a great part of Scotland; and it has been effected, where it has been effected, by the *Christian* ministers, of the *Christian* established church of Scotland, who, let it be observed, are appointed to their ministries *by the heritors*! And here we have the true reason why the people of Scotland, why the middle classes in Scotland, whose justice and humanity revolt at this robbery of the poor, secede from this established church; and why they are now *praying the Parliament to take away from the heritors this power of appointing the ministers*! *Christian* ministers, indeed! The very first duty of every *Christian* is, to "feed the hungry," clothe the naked, and harbour the harbourless. "Sell all that thou hast, and give it to the poor." "I was hungry, and you

"gave me not to eat; I was athirst, "and you gave me not to drink."

These are the words of him, of whom these *Christian* ministers of Scotland profess themselves to be followers; they who are the tools in the hands of the rich, to rob, to beggar, and to degrade, unfortunate and indigent persons. Let us now look, then, at some of the works of these *Christian* ministers of Scotland, and of their hard-hearted patrons, the heritors. Let us see the condition to which they have reduced the working-people of Scotland; and then we shall see the ultimate intention and the natural effects of this poor-law bill; we shall see the reasons that induced the amiable Lord ALTHORP to wish to introduce the northern system into the southern parts of the country. *Stupidity* is generally the companion of injustice. Accordingly, we find, amongst the immense mass of print that has been laid before us in the House of Commons, a report from two poor-law commissioners, who were instructed to prowl about Scotland, in order, apparently, to ascertain how the heritors of Scotland had gone to work to get rid of all charge on account of the poor, in order that the *heritors*, or *landowners* of England might accomplish the same purpose. The names of these commissioners were TUFNELL and JOHNSTON, whose reports will be found in appendix to grand report, A, part No. 2, and, at the pages which I shall mention as I go along. These fellows conclude their report by recommending the *forcible putting an end to all assessments in Scotland*, by act of Parliament, and to put an end to them altogether, gradually, in *England*! It is necessary to keep this their recommendation in view, in order to comprehend what they mean, and what their employers mean, through the whole of the proceeding. I now begin with the report of TUFNELL and of JOHNSTON.

1. TUFNELL complains (page 194) that, "the *pauperism* is ascribable "in a great measure to the "assessments, and thinks that the "knowledge that the poor have of "a legal claim to relief removes

"their reluctance to come to the parish; that they now claim, as *a right*, this relief."

2. That as to *the treatment of the poor* by the HERITORS and the MINISTERS, take these facts: "That it is the practice, when a poor person comes to the assessment fund, to make an inventory of his goods, and to *sell them after his death for the BENEFIT OF THE HERITORS.* (Page 195). "When an individual is found *very urgent* in claiming support, we insist upon his *bequeathing his effects to the parish*, before he gets the relief. In ordinary cases we do not resort to this measure, as most frequently the applicants have nothing but a *pot, a bed, and a few bed-clothes*, all of which would not sell for *twenty shillings.* When a pauper dies, however, we generally take possession of his effects, if they be of any value at all."
3. With regard to the *amount of relief*, and the mode of relief: it is sometimes in money, sometimes in goods, and sometimes in workhouse. Tufnell, in page 203, describes the many ceremonies a poor person has to go through before he gets relief, and the sum never exceeds 5s. a month; and, in some cases, not more than fourteen shillings a year. At page 225, "The sums given by us are small, a *penny a day* is, perhaps, as much as many poor women in this parish may have." In page 222, Johnston relates that, "the poor at Dumfries do not receive more than 14s. a year a-piece: the poorest used to have *licenses to beg* within the parish, being compelled at the same time to *wear a badge.* Those licenses are now withdrawn, and all the poor placed on the poor-roll, or pension-list."
4. With regard to the "*lofty-mindedness*"; that "*high spirit*" which is to be created in England by an abolition of the poor-laws; that

"*high moral condition*" of which Mr. Hume so frequently speaks, TUFNELL (page 193) tells us of "the decreasing reluctance of the poor to apply for relief." In page 209, he tells us, that "they had no objection to go to the public soup-kettle; that, to prevent their relief given them being spent in drink, it was sometimes given in necessities instead of money." And JOHNSTON tells us, in page 226, "we give in kind rather than in money; because when they get money it is spent often as it ought not to be. They contrive also to *exchange the provisions for their favourite beverage*; but it is not so easily effected in every case."

5. As to their condition, JOHNSTON tells us in page 223, "The Scotch labourers consider it is as *no disparagement* to be put on the poor-roll; the habit of drinking ardent spirits is now become general amongst the labouring classes, not only injuring their health and paralysing their industry, but depraving their character, and rendering them insensible to all respect for public opinion or regard for decency of conduct. About a third of the women, and *all* the children, are without shoes and stockings, and oatmeal, the cheapest of diets, is the universal and principal food."
6. PERSONAL DECENCY. The following fact is taken from TUFNELL'S report, page 210. It would well shock every English *man*, and what will it do to every English *woman*!

TUFNELL is relating what took place at DALKEITH in consequence of the "wise and judicious proceedings of the minister," for abolishing assessments and driving people out of a workhouse that was there; and he tells us that, "when the project of abolishing the poor-house was first mentioned to its inmates, they were very averse to leave it; now however they are *all pleased*

“with their change of situation,
 “and would be very unwilling to
 “return to it. As I was desirous
 “of ascertaining this fact, and also
 “of seeing the condition of some
 “of the poor who had been turned
 “out of the workhouse, I requested
 “the minister to accompany me to
 “one of their houses. We accord-
 “ingly visited three persons, *one*
 “*old man and two old women*, who
 “were lodged together in one room,
 “for which the parish paid 6d. per
 “week, which, with 5s. a week
 “between them, was all they got.
 “Had they remained in the work-
 “house the expense would have
 “been 10s. 9d. per week, at 3s. 7d.
 “each; the parish gains by the
 “change 5s. 3d. * * *

“The charitable sympathies of the
 “neighbours, which were before
 “thoroughly dried up, both as re-
 “spect them and every other in-
 “mate of the poor-house, had
 “begun to operate in their favour,
 “and they were receiving some
 “little attentions from their friends,
 “which the minister confidently
 “expected would increase; and
 “that this, together with the pro-
 “duce of what slight work their
 “infirmities would allow them to
 “perform, *would shortly enable him*
 “to DIMINISH THEIR PAY,
 “and perhaps to WITHDRAW
 “IT ALTOGETHER.”

There needs only this last fact! In this one fact we have a sample of the justice of the heritors, of the Christian charity of the minister, of the high-mindedness, that Mr. EWING of GLASGOW talked of, and of the high state of moral feeling, which has so often been the subject of eulogium with Mr. HUME. Go, my Lord ALTHORP, and tell the people of Sussex, of Surrey, of Kent, of Hampshire, of Norfolk, of Suffolk, or of Essex; go and tell them, that you want to improve them, till you have brought two women to consent to live day and night, with one man, in one room, for which sixpence a week

shall be paid. Go into those counties and find two women, except they be found in a brothel, who will consent to live in the same morsel of a room with a man, day and night.

This is the high moral state to which the savage heritors of Scotland have brought the poor people of that country. This is what is to be imitated in England. We see that the “neighbours,” in the middle rank of life, and in the lower rank, too, came to the assistance of these poor people. They were too just to suffer them to starve; they had enough of Christian charity in them to save the poor wretches; and this led the “minister of CHRIST”: this encouraged his “Christian charity” to hope, that he should be able to take away their allowance altogether! What will CHRIST say to this minister, when he appears at the last day? Will he applaud him, or will he send him to the receptacle of those, who have violated his laws and despised his commands!

But, reader, do, for God’s sake, look over this statement of these commissioners. You find here proofs of the most barbarous treatment of the poor; you find an account of their having “licenses to beg,” wearing a beggar’s badge, as a proof of their “high moral condition.” You have here an assertion that they are relieved in kind, lest they should get drunk with the money; you have an assertion here, that they are insensible to all respect for public opinion, or their regard for decency of conduct; as proofs, doubtless, of the salutary effects of that “education,” with which Lord ALTHORP means to elevate the characters of the working people of England. You have a confession here, that all the children are without shoes and stockings, and that a third part of the women are in the same state, to which might have been added, that the women servants and other women at rough work, pin their petticoats up considerably above their knees. I would rather that the infernal regions would open and swallow England, than that the benevolent Lord ALTHORP, by his bill, should reduce

English women to this miserable state.

But, reader, for God Almighty's sake, look at the paragraph, to which I have put number 2; and, if, on this side of Satan's dominions; on this side of everlasting fire, you can find baseness and barbarity equal to that, do, for God's sake, produce it, in order to mitigate the inexpressible hatred, the burning rage, with which our hearts are filled against these Scotch heritors, and their servile and barbarous priests.

I beg the reader not to think, that I impute this barbarity to the middling class of people in Scotland. On the contrary, I witnessed an anxiety and a zeal amongst them, particularly at EDINBURGH, to obtain due relief for the poor, such as I never witnessed before; and, indeed, I could not, because in England and America there is a legal and efficient provision by law. I have never personally known one Scotchman, and conversed with him upon the subject, who did not complain of this barbarous conduct of the heritors and the ministers; and who was not anxious to see the English system established in Scotland. I shall presently have to insert a letter just received from Mr. LITTLE of ANNAN; and his sentiments are those of every Scotchman that I have ever heard open his lips upon the subject. At EDINBURGH, at DUNFERMLINE, at FALKIRK, at GLASGOW, GREENOCK, PAISLEY, NEW MILNS, KILMARNOCK, DUMFRIES, ANNAN; every where they beset me with complaints, that their poor were ill-treated; and that the heritors were the cause of the vast difference between the enjoyments of the English and Scotch working people.

What! does Lord ALTHORP wish to take away the table cloth, the knives, forks, and plates, and the meat and the bread, from the labourers of Sussex; and to give them the Scotch dirty stool, brose bowl and spoon, in the stead? Does he want to sweep away the neat garden, the embowered privy; and to take away the shoes and stockings of the women of Sussex, and to give them the bare legs and feet, and

the dunghill of the Scotch labourer's dwelling. If he do, a word in his ear. You will not effect your object, my lord; but your name, as long as it live at all, will live coupled on to the intention to do it.

The poor people of Scotland are as good, in their nature, as the people of England; and they show this upon all occasions; they are debased by the violation of the laws of their country, which compels them, when destitute, to BEG for the means of maintaining life, instead of demanding those means as a *right*. This is the cause of the degradation of the working people of Scotland; and to their state, nevertheless, the heritors of England wish to reduce the people of England.

Such are the observations which naturally arise from reading the reports of the poor-law commissioners themselves. Then we have the notorious facts, that Scotch vagrants are sent back by hundreds from Cumberland and Northumberland, and that there are regular contracts for the sending of them back; before Mr. HUME makes further attempts to elevate the English to the high moral condition of the Scotch; and before Mr. EWING again asserts, that the poor of Scotland, however necessitated, would spurn parochial relief, let the former put an end to this incursion of Scotch vagrants, and let the latter reconcile with the "*high spirit*" and the "*spurning*," the fact that these thousands of Scotch invade England every year, to throw themselves upon the parishes of England.

After this comes another undeniable fact; that, in 1819, the injustice and cruelty of the heritors, and of the ministers of the established church, had produced a state of distress, among the poor of Scotland, indescribable. And, what was done then? Did the barbarous heritors do justice? Did they, when hundreds and hundreds were starving, give relief? Did the cry of starvation soften their hearts? Yes; but not to give any part of that which they had unjustly kept; but to make an application to Parliament for a

grant of money for the relief of the poor in Scotland! Upon that occasion LIVERPOOL said one of the only two sensible things that I ever heard him say in my life, which was this: "No: let the noble lord ask for an act to establish our poor-law in Scotland, and he shall have it; but if Scotland will not relieve its own poor, I never will consent that England shall do it." Some Scotch lord having then taken occasion to say something against the operation of the poor-laws in England, Lord ELDON said, "that the Scotch landowners could not fail to see the wisdom of the English poor-laws; but that they wanted the justice to adopt them."

I have now to insert a letter just received from Mr. LITTLE of ANNAN, which the reader will remark, is in DUMFRIES-SHIRE, in Scotland. I do beg the reader's best attention to the whole of this letter. Mr. LITTLE clearly perceives the object of the scheme that is now going on: he perceives that the English landlords want to be put upon a footing with the Scotch heritors, and with the grinders of Ireland. He clearly shows that the English FARMER would not be benefited by the change; but, on the contrary, greatly injured by it. It is notorious that the Scotch farmers are in a great deal worse state than the farmers in England. This is very well worthy the attention of the farmers: no lightening of their share of the burden is intended by this bill. The poor-laws prevent the labourers from being ground down to low wages, and to living upon roots and oatmeal. The greedy English heritors want to get the wages and the amount of the relief into their own pockets, as they do in Scotland and Ireland. If they could rob the poor, make them work for next to nothing, and make them live upon the meanest of food, they would make the farmers pay them *double rent*, and the parson would get from them double tithes, unless where it is taken in kind. So that nobody would be benefited but the greedy heritors. I now insert Mr. LITTLE's letter, beseeching every farmer in particular to pay attention to it.

TO MR. WILLIAM COBBETT, M.P.

Annan, 14. June, 1834.

SIR,—I deem this a proper time for resuming the subject of the Scotch poor-laws, and referring to a very few of those numerous instances within my knowledge of their cruel operation, in so far as the poor are concerned.

1. In a parish distant only a few miles from this town a poor female, crippled in both her arms, and totally incapable of labour, applied, about twenty years ago, for parochial relief, and readily obtained an allowance of *eighteen-pence per week*. After receiving this allowance for many years a legacy of nine pounds fell to her, whereupon the heritors and kirk-session instantly withdrew it. The legacy, which has been husbanded with great economy, being now at last all expended, she has again applied for parochial relief. Though *twenty years older* than when she first applied, and much more infirm than she then was, and though it is not pretended that she has a farthing in the world, all that has been allowed to her (thanks to the progress of Malthusian principles) is only *sixpence per week*, or somewhat less than *a penny per day*! Upon this pittance, however, she must be contented to live, or rather to starve; because, as mentioned in my former letters, she has no redress but *through the medium of the Court of Session; a court into which, for the reason there stated, she never can hope to enter*.

2. In the same parish, about sixteen years ago, an infirm and worn-out female made an application in the usual manner for parochial relief. The answer to her application consisted in an *admission of her infirmity*, accompanied by a *denial of her right of settlement*, founded on an allegation that, although she belonged to the parish, she was the wife of a man still living, (this man had cruelly abandoned her almost thirty years before!) who had acquired a settlement in England, at the distance of at least *one hundred and fifty miles*! One would naturally have imagined, that in such circumstances any humane system of poor-laws would have provided that the parish, *in which the poor woman*

was should relieve her in the meantime, and that, having found out the parish of her husband, they should, at their own expense, remove her to, and fix her upon, that parish. NOT SO, HOWEVER, THE POOR-LAWS OF SCOTLAND. In perfect consistency with those laws the heritors and kirk-session, while they left the poor woman to starve, simply said, "*Your settlement is not in our parish, and we will give you nothing, either for maintenance or removal.*" As the case related to settlement it was tried before the sheriff. Though it was scarcely credible that the husband, a journeyman cooper, could ever have acquired a settlement in England, by the renting of premises worth 10*l.* per annum; a sort of proof to that effect was brought by the parish. This proof was deemed sufficient to warrant a dismissal of the claim for relief without any allowance for removal. And the poor helpless creature, unable from poverty and infirmity to stir from where she was, and left without the means of living, soon relieved the parish altogether of the scandal of her presence, by quietly removing to a better world.

3. On the 28. day of December, 1820, the minister of another parish in the vicinity of this town, which parish I may observe, belongs almost entirely to our heritor, gave a certificate in these terms to one of his flock: "I hereby certify, that the bearer ——— is a parishioner of ——— within the boundaries of which he has resided thirteen years without being burdensome to the public, and maintaining, so far as known to me or the kirk-session, a blameless character. He is now an old infirm man, about seventy-eight years of age, and has, during the last two years, lain in an open tent in a dike side, in consequence of [here is inserted the name of the heritor before alluded to] having prohibited his tenants from giving him a house." This certificate related to a man who had seen better days, whose character, as it bears, was blameless; who had never applied for parochial aid, and who was not likely to do so, because he was well supported by a

dutiful son, who had gone abroad in his early youth, and was then in the West Indies. The heritor, however, having either taken offence at him for some unknown cause, or wishing to throw him upon another parish, had issued the cruel prohibition referred to by the minister. The certificate was given in the hope that the law of Scotland might afford redress against such gross oppression. NO SUCH REDRESS, HOWEVER, COULD THAT LAW AFFORD. The poor, and I may add venerable, old man, after passing two winters, and these very stormy ones, in "the open tent by the dike side," at last resigned his breath to his Maker in that very "open tent"; and at the age of eighty, and with becoming marks of respect on the part of his more humble neighbours, was carried from it to his last and long abode.

4. In the month of April, 1831, the minister of another parish, situate in Dumfries-shire, gave a certificate to a female residing within his bounds in these terms: "I hereby certify, that the bearer ——— is a native of this parish. Her parents were in great poverty, their house having been burned and their furniture consumed. She is now an orphan without a house, and without other means of support than public charity, being UNABLE TO MAINTAIN HERSELF BY HER INDUSTRY, as she is subject to convulsion fits. I BELIEVE HER TO BE A FIT OBJECT OF CHARITY." The purpose of this certificate, as is obvious from the wording of it, was, that it might serve as a passport for begging; and it was so used accordingly, by the poor woman to whom it was given, throughout a district consisting of perhaps twenty parishes, and for a period of nearly twelve months. At last, however, as was naturally to be expected, it lost its efficacy; and the poor creature found it necessary in consequence to apply to her parish for relief in the ordinary way. On doing so she was surprised by an answer, through the medium of the very minister who had given the certificate before quoted, to the effect that her settlement was *not* in her parish! Having in vain endeavoured to convince him of his error, she

at last made an application to the sheriff for the purpose of having the question of settlement decided. After a litigation of twelve months in the Sheriff's Court, she was completely successful on this point; and the serious nature of the process, to a person such as she is, may be judged of from this circumstance, that the costs awarded against the parish amounted to 15*l.* or 16*l.* sterling!

The question of settlement being thus decided, it became necessary for the parish to do *something*. And what, it will naturally be asked, did the parish do? Why, notwithstanding the helpless condition of the applicant, as detailed in the certificate before quoted; notwithstanding their admission in the Sheriff's Court, that she was "*unable to maintain herself by her own industry*"; that she was "*an orphan, without friends or any means of subsistence other than public charity*"; and that she was "*a fit object for parochial relief*"; notwithstanding these things, they made an allowance to her of no more than SIX-SEVENTHS OF A PENNY PER DAY! They thus set at defiance the order of the sheriff, which, *proceeding on their own admission*, was, not that they should "*consider*" the poor woman's case merely, but that they should "*maintain her as a pauper*." They in short adopted the *second* of the two modes mentioned in my letter of 10. March, by which heritors in Scotland so frequently make use of to evade the just claims of the poor of their respective parishes.

It will naturally be supposed by the humane people of England, that *some provision* would be made for this poor woman during the long period of the litigation in the Sheriff's Court; but nothing, I am sorry to say, can be more erroneous than such supposition. The sheriff, it is true, *recommended* an interim allowance by the parish, being all that he deemed himself empowered to do; but the parish paid no regard to his recommendation. The poor woman notwithstanding is YET ALIVE. She owes no thanks for her life however to the POOR-LAWS OF SCOTLAND. Had the matter depended on them alone, the parish

would long since have been freed by the "*decay of nature*" from all apprehension on her account. That she has been able to live since May, 1832, and to prosecute her claim, is *entirely owing to the charity of an individual who never saw or heard of her prior to that month*.

To these instances, *the proof of every one of which is within my power, and ready to be produced*, I could, without difficulty add many more of the like character, all within my own knowledge. Instead, however, of lengthening this letter by doing so, I shall conclude by asserting, as in reference to the poor-laws of Scotland, *to which, as it would seem those of England are now to be assimilated*, 1st, That, under these poor-laws, any able-bodied labouring man, who is not himself an *heritor*, may at any time be *driven from the parish of his settlement*, if he do not choose to take up his abode by the "*dike side*"; and, 2ndly, That the heritors of any parish may with complete legal impunity, starve to death any "*aged, lame, or impotent*" person within their bounds, by simply stating, in answer to a claim for relief by such person, "*Your settlement is not with us: or we (the payers, viz.) do not consider you to be a fit object for parochial relief*"!

But it is contended by a certain class of theorists, that a legal provision for the support of the poor is, when philosophically considered, a measure inconsistent with sound policy, because, by removing the *fear of absolute want*, a powerful spur to exertion, it tends to render the labouring classes idle and profligate, and thus produces the evil which it professes to remedy. But how does this doctrine, plausible though it certainly is, square with well-established facts? If there be one portion of the kingdom more than another in which all the evils *really* consequent on the English poor-laws may be expected to be found, that portion must necessarily be the southern agricultural counties of England, where these laws are most completely in operation. How comes it, then, that we hear so much from every traveller, of the "*neat, clean, and com-*

fortable cottages" of the labourers of those counties, of their "beautiful gardens," and of all their domestic comforts? Is it possible to believe for a moment, that such things could be if those labourers, *debased by the poor-laws*, were really an IDLE AND PROFLIGATE RACE?

Again, it has been asserted, and in the House of Commons too, that in proportion as the "principle of the English poor-laws" has been introduced into Scotland, so the condition of the labouring classes in that part of the kingdom has been deteriorated. Assuming that the term, "principle of the English poor-laws" here used, means the imposing of *legal assessments* for the relief of the poor, by the heritors and kirk-sessions of particular parishes, and this is all that it can mean, because no other principle has ever been introduced into Scotland: assuming this to be the case, let it be inquired for a little, what portion of truth there is in the assertion. It is a fact which admits of no dispute, that, in the Scotch counties of *Berwick* and *Roxburgh*, there have in almost every parish been legal assessments for the relief of the poor for a long series of years past, while in the Scotch counties of *Kirkcudbright* and *Wigtown*, such assessments are rare, comparatively speaking, even at this day. But, will any one venture to say, that the labouring classes in the counties of *Berwick* and *Roxburgh*, are in a worse condition than those in the counties of *Kirkcudbright* and *Wigtown*? He must be a bold man indeed, who will take upon him to make this assertion! Though the labouring classes of the two former counties are not, perhaps, to be compared in point of comfort or good living with the possessors of the neat, clean, and comfortable cottages and gardens before spoken of, they are still pretty far removed from want; and it may be asserted, without fear of contradiction from any one at all acquainted with the matter, that in their persons, their clothing, and their habitations, they are decidedly superior to the same classes in *any* of those portions of Scotland where recourse has not yet been had to the English "principle" of legal assessment.

If farther proof on this point be wanted, let the person desirous of having it, take a ride of a fortnight at any convenient season, beginning at the southern part of the *English* county of *Northumberland*, travelling northward through that county, westward through the Scotch counties of *Berwick*, *Roxburgh*, *Dumfries*, *Kirkcudbright*, and *Wigtown*, and then passing across to Ireland. He will thus have an opportunity of observing the effects of the poor-laws, in all their gradations, from the old English system, to no system at all. In *Northumberland*, where the old English system prevails, he will see among the working classes nearly all the comfort that could be wished. In *Berwickshire* and *Roxburghshire*, he will witness a little, and but a very little, diminution of that comfort. As he passes along, he will observe gradually less and less of it at every step. When he arrives in IRELAND, where there are *no poor-laws*, and where, consequently, from the unobstructed operation of the "spur" aforesaid, there ought according to theory, to be no debasement and no want, he will find a labouring population, the most wretched, perhaps, that ever was seen upon the face of the earth! And if he will take the trouble of questioning the miserable beggars whom he will observe in shoals upon the road, after he enters *Dumfriesshire*, he will learn from the dialect, if not from the words in which their answers are given, that nineteen out of every twenty of them have come from the West!

One of the well-known effects of poor-laws is, to *raise the wages of labour* and *lower the rents of land*: and hence it is that landlords hate them! Of three acres of tithe-free land of equal quality, one situate in England, another in Scotland, and the third in Ireland, if the rent of the first be 20s., the rent of the second will be at least 40s., and the rent of the third, not less, perhaps, to the immediate cultivator than 4l. sterling. *Here the operation of the poor-laws is perfectly evident.* Where the access to relief is ready, as in England, the labourer must have a fair share of the pro-

duce of his own labour ; where it is not so ready, as in Scotland, he must be content with somewhat less than a fair share ; and where, as in Ireland, there is no relief at all, nearly all goes to rent, and nothing is left for him but potatoes. The introduction of poor-laws into Ireland would speedily cure this dreadful evil. After such introduction, the condition of the English and Scotch labourer would not be deteriorated by the influx of crowds of wretched Irishmen, accustomed to live upon the poorest sort of food, and willing to work for half wages ; after such introduction, the condition of the Irish labourer himself would quickly be improved ; and in a short time the world would cease to witness the monstrous anomaly of a country producing and annually exporting immense quantities of the best of human food, while the very labourers by whose toil that food is produced, are precluded from touching any portion of it, compelled, in the most favourable seasons, to live upon a miserable root, and when that root fails them, reduced to a state of absolute starvation !

I think it a pity that so many of those members of Parliament, who, from their *other* acts, seem to be sincerely anxious for the good of the country, should labour under so complete a delusion on this all-important subject. A man who knows England *alone*, who has been accustomed to hear the *squalling* of the rate-payers there (and all payers of money squall occasionally), and who has fallen in with two or three Scotchmen more cunning than honest "i' the South," has a very imperfect knowledge indeed. He ought to *see* and *examine* the people of both countries. Were he to do this, his ignorance would be speedily removed, both as to rate-payers and as to rate-receivers. He would hear a tenant of the *Earl of Lonsdale* in *Cumberland* or *Westmoreland*, complain bitterly of the demands of the overseer ; but, if he asked that same tenant to exchange situations with a tenant of the *Earl of Mansfield* in *Dumfries-shire* on whom *no overseer for the poor ever calls*, he would soon discover that poor-rates, under the old English system, are

not such a grievance as he was led to fancy. He would find, that, while they certainly and surely *better the condition of the labourer*, they, at the same time, barring mis-management, always ensure better profits to the farmer.

I am,

Dear Sir,

Yours very sincerely,

JAS. LITTLE.

So much for the Scotch poor-laws, and for their effects ; so much for that "*elevation of character*"; that "*independence*," of which we hear so much, as produced by the Scotch system of managing the poor.

Thus, then, we have three countries to make laws for. In one we have seen the labouring people for ages, living in neat cottages, with pretty gardens, and with table cloths, knives and forks, and meat, bread, and beer : one, the people living in filthy holes, without table cloths, knives or forks, or meat, or bread ; their legs and feet bare, and their sole diet, the coarsest of oatmeal : one, the people living solely upon potatoes, at the best, inhabiting the same sty with the pig, with their bodies half naked. One would think that it was the state of the *two latter* countries, which would awaken in us a desire to make a change in them, with regard to the treatment of the poor ; but this is so far from being the case, that we propose to leave these two countries just as they are, and are hard at work to make a change in the state of the first country. This we produce to the people as a mark of our sincerity. The *real object* of this bill has been closely disguised ; but, before it become a law, that object will be clearly understood by every man in the kingdom.

With regard to the proceedings on this bill in the House of Commons, the House was in a committee on the clauses, on last Friday night, on Monday night, and on Wednesday night, when the remainder of the clauses were gone through. On Friday I moved the following :

"That there be laid before this House

"an account of all salaries, allowances, printing expenses, expenses of messengers, and expenses of every description occasioned by the Poor-Laws Commission; also a statement whether any of the Commissioners hold other commissions, or fill any offices for which they receive any pay out of the public purse; specifying what commission, or what office, and also specifying the sum or sums so received; and stating further, whether the secretary to the Commissioners holds any other post of emolument, and what post, and the amount of such emolument."

This motion was agreed to, but the papers have not yet been laid before the House. On Monday I moved the following resolution, previous to the Speaker leaving the chair; and this motion was rejected by the following numbers:

For the motion, . . . 5

Against it 113

Majority 108

"That it is just and expedient to enact that, before any assessment for the relief of the poor shall hereafter be made upon the general property, in any parish of England or Wales, an assessment shall be made on the revenue of the incumbent of such parish, arising from the benefice thereof, to the amount of one-fourth of the net annual amount of the said revenue; that a like assessment, for the same purpose, shall be made on all abbey-lands, and on impropriate tithes (if such there be), in each parish respectively, to the amount of one-fourth of the net annual receipt from the rents or profits of such abbey-lands, or such impropriate or lay-tithes; that no other assessment, for the relief of the poor, shall be made in any parish, unless the amount of these assessments shall be found insufficient for giving relief to the poor, according to the provisions of the act of the 43. year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth; and that, if these assessments be found insufficient in any parish,

"then shall be made, in aid thereof, on the whole of the lands and tenements and tithes in such parish, including the abbey-lands, the impropriate or lay-tithes, and also the tithes, manse, and glebe, of the incumbent of the parish, an assessment, agreeably to the said act, passed in the 43. year of Elizabeth."

Those who voted in the minority were:

William Cobbett.

Feergus O'Connor.

John Fielden.

W. F. Finn.

E. Rathven, jun.

On Wednesday night I moved the following proviso to the seventy-third clause, which clause provides that the fathers, grandfathers, mothers, grandmothers, child, or children, of persons chargeable on the parish, shall, if they have the means of doing it, relieve themselves, and take the charge from the parish. Whereupon I moved this proviso, which I now insert,

"Provided always, that, in manner as aforesaid, the fathers, grandfathers, mothers, grandmothers, child, or children, of any person who is upon the pension list, the sinecure list, the list of retired allowances, list of widows' pensions, compassionate list, and all or any of the other lists of persons receiving, without service, money of taxes raised upon the working people, and others, shall, if such father, grandfather, mother, grandmother, child, or children, be persons of substance, be liable and compellable to yield relief, or maintenance to such pensioned person, under all the penalties and forfeitures provided for by the act of the forty-third of Elizabeth; and that, henceforward, all such pensions and other emoluments shall cease to be paid."

I divided the House upon this proviso, when the numbers were:

Against it 113

For it 18

Majority 95

Those who voted in the minority were as follow :

Blake, M. J.
Buckingham, J. S.
Butler, Colonel
Cobbett, W.
Fielden, John
Finn, W. F.
Gaskell, D.
Gulley, John
Hodges, T. Law
Heathcote, John
Maxwell, John
O'Connor, Feargus
O'Connell, D.
O'Connell, Morgan
O'Connell, John
O'Brien, —
Ruthven, Edward
Thompson, Alderman

On the same evening Mr. ROBINSON, member for WORCESTER, after a very able speech, made a motion to leave out all the clauses relating to bastardy, those being the clauses from 69 to 72, inclusive. This motion was rejected, the numbers being:

Against Mr. Robinson's motion 114
For it..... 33

Majority 81

The names of the minority I cannot obtain, at present. After this the other clauses were gone through, and the House appears to have separated at *four o'clock in the morning*. It is to go into the subject again on Saturday (after this *Register* will have come from the press); and it is supposed, that the House of Commons will have done with it in a week or ten days. Here, *in print*, I cannot say of this bill, that which I wish to say; but the people of OLDHAM have enabled me to say it in the House, and in the House I say it; and, if it pass into a law, the consequences will be, I hope, such as they ought to be.

I have received a sort of circular recommendation upon this subject, full of good sense, that I am very sorry to be compelled to believe will not be listened to. I insert it here as well worthy the attention of my readers, and still more

worthy the attention of members of Parliament.

To the Members of the British Legislature.

Much experience, and more observation on the subject, during the last thirty years, will, I trust, obtain for me your pardon, for thus addressing you, as a legislator, on the proposed alteration of our poor-laws. Those laws, after the experience of two hundred and forty years, are allowed, even by the advocates of a change, to be intrinsically good; the evils complained of being admitted to arise from their violation. The subject is of vital importance to many of the poorer classes, and equally so to the general prosperity of the country. In such case many evils may result from precipitancy; none can arise from due consideration. What I have humbly to propose is, "that so soon as the bill comes out of committee and is printed, a copy of it shall be sent to every parish in the kingdom, requiring the overseers, subject to a penalty, to call a public meeting of the rate-payers in each, and to transmit the resolutions and opinions of such meeting on the subject, to Government, by a certain time." By this means the collective sense of the whole nation will be obtained. As the subject is one which affects individual parishes differently, and each has to bear its own burden, they must certainly be the best judges of the probable effects of the bill as bearing upon themselves, and as the question has become so generally impressed upon their notice, there can be no danger of a little delay being materially injurious in any case. As, therefore, no calculable injury can arise, but, on the contrary, much possible evil may be prevented, and good done by the proposed postponement, I hope that you will exert your influence in every way to promote it, in which hope,

I remain,

With the highest respect,

Your truly obedient Servant,

SAMUEL ROBERTS.

Park Grange, 17. June, 1834.

We have been told, that one of the motives for passing this bill is, to put an end to parish-jobbing. The poor-law commissioners, in their report, have published an instance of this jobbing in the parish of St. LUKE, Middlesex, on the evidence given them by a Mr. RICHMOND, one of the guardians of the poor of that parish. The guardians of the poor of that parish have met, and have made a publication as follows. This publication is well worthy the attention of every man in the kingdom. It shows what reliance is to be placed upon the evidence raked together by these commissioners. Here is the character of this parish aspersed, and the aspersions sent, at the country's expense, all over the kingdom; and, which is worse, this evidence is made the foundation of a law oversetting the most important laws in existence. The publication is as follows :

POOR-LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

Saint Luke, Middlesex.

At a general meeting of the vestrymen of this parish, held in the church on Thursday, the 5. of June, 1834, publicly convened, to take into consideration certain evidence said to have been given by Mr. RICHMOND, one of the guardians of the poor of this parish, to the commissioners of the poor-laws, as printed in their Report: viz. "When I came into office it was a recognised principle that the purchase of commodities for parochial consumption should be confined to the tradesmen of the parish. The effects of the patronage incident to the purchase of goods to the amount of upwards of 20,000*l.* per annum, from shopkeepers within the parish, patronage exercised by a Board who are themselves shopkeepers, or connected with shopkeepers, may well be conceived. For several years I have contended, but unsuccessfully, for the universal application of the principle that contracts should be taken from those who made the lowest tenders, wherever they resided, provided they gave the requisite securities for the due performance of the contract. On investigating the

purchases of goods within the parish, I found that some of the charges were upwards of 40 per cent. above the market prices. Whatever opposition may be made against an extensive or efficient reform, or generalization of the management of the funds for the relief of the poor, will be based on the retention of parochial patronage and power, although such a motive will never be ostensibly avowed. I have no doubt they will even assume that extended management will be more profuse than their own."

Mr. WILLIAM WOOD, Churchwarden,
in the Chair.

Resolved unanimously,—That the statement made by Mr. Richmond, to the commissioners of poor-law inquiry is utterly *without foundation in truth*, because it is clearly proved that instead of its being a "recognised principle," that the purchase of goods for parochial consumption should be confined to the tradesmen of the parish, upon an average of the last seven years, five-sixths of the sums laid out have been expended with persons living out of the parish; that instead of goods being purchased to the amount of 20,000*l.* per annum, the whole amount has very little exceeded 6,000*l.* upon an average, and has not in any one year amounted to 7,000*l.*, and of that sum only 1,040*l.* per annum, upon an average, instead of upwards of 20,000*l.* has been expended with tradesmen in the parish; that instead of Mr. Richmond having had to contend unsuccessfully for the universal application of the principle, that contracts should be taken from those who made the lowest tenders, wherever they resided, that principle was in operation long before Mr. Richmond entered the parish, and continues to the present time, it being the regular practice to contract for the supply of all the principal articles of consumption with those who made the lowest tender, whether they resided in or out of the parish, after advertisements in the daily papers; that instead of the purchase of goods being used as a means of patronage and power, the tradesmen employed to

serve the parish with those articles that could not be contracted for, have frequently been persons opposed to the guardians of the poor upon parochial matters, as was the case in the person alluded to by Mr. Richmond, who made an overcharge upon an article amounting to 30s., and was detected (but not by Mr. Richmond), and was declared by the guardian board disqualified from ever supplying goods to the workhouse again.

That the following tabular statement details the exact amounts of the whole expenditure in the purchase of goods during the last seven years, together with the manner in which those goods have been obtained :

	1828	1829	1830	1831	1832	1833	1834
Years ending Lady-day							
Gross amount paid for Goods	£ 6536	6984	6255	5342	6441	5940	5483
Out of which contracted for by public advertisement...	4559	4555	4641	3718	4411	4526	4281
Not contracted for	1977	2429	1614	1624	2030	1414	1202
Of which bought out of the parish.....	578	940	614	611	872	945	445
Bought in the parish.....	£ 1399	1489	1000	1013	1158	469	757

There is a gross deception as to the amount of money actually expended on

the poor. The whole sum raised in the name of poor-rates, amounts to 8,700,000*l.*; and this is all set down to the poor. My belief is that the poor get very little more than one half of it. The following letter from BOLTON will elucidate this matter in a most satisfactory manner.

TO MR. COBBETT, M.P.

Bolton, 10. June, 1834.

Sir,—In the London papers of Saturday, I saw the report of a speech delivered by you in the House of Commons on the Poor-Laws Amendment Bill, as it is called, which you concluded by giving notice of a motion for a select committee to inquire into the cause of the poor-rates before the bill was further proceeded in.

Agreeing as I do with the views you have taken with regard to this very important measure, I think it may not be amiss to send you the report of the overseers of the poor for the township of Little-Bolton, by which you will see, that the money collected *under the denomination of poor-rates* is disposed of for other purposes than that of relieving the poor. That out of 1,455*l.*, 745*l.* are paid to the poor, and 710*l.* go for salaries to the overseer, to the collector of the rates, for session fees, &c., &c., the particulars of which I will put down in order that you may have the items in one view before you, as the remainder of the report consists in money paid to the poor belonging to other places, which is repayable, and to bastardy cases which is also repayable, and consequently not necessarily connected with the object I have in view. I will just add that the township of Little-Bolton has not lost 20*l.* in the last twenty years by fathers of illegitimate children. If the proposed *amendment* had been law during that time the township would have lost many hundreds of pounds, besides the demoralizing effects which such a system would have engendered.

Hoping you will obtain the appointment of a committee for the purpose mentioned in your notice, in order that

honourable gentlemen may see causes at work other than those of the poor-laws, by which their estates are in greater danger of being swallowed up.

PAID TO THE POOR.

	£	s.	d.
Regular Poor, as per list ..	599	4	9
Casual Poor	4	7	8
Clothing	6	0	2
Burials	28	10	5
Turton Workhouse	75	2	0
Dispensary Subscription and Surgeons	16	1	0
Edgworth Workhouse	1	5	3
Vagrants	3	1	6
Journeys and Removals ..	11	16	7
	£ 745	9	4

OTHER EXPENSES.

	£	s.	d.
County Rates	338	2	9
Cleaning, Coals, &c.	8	12	7
Stationery, &c	15	0	8
Salaries	200	0	0
Sessions Fees, &c	6	11	0
Summonses and Warrants	3	18	0
Constables Accounts	94	1	0
Law Expenses	33	2	6
Sundry Accounts	2	6	11
Lists for County and Bo-rough votes	6	19	11
Assessors	1	4	0
Postages of Letters	4	10	5
	£ 714	9	9

These are all collected under the denomination of poor-rates.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

THOS. MYERSCOUGH.

MR. O'CONNELL.

SOMETIME ago, General COCKBURN published a letter in the newspapers, in which he stated his suspicion that Mr. O'CONNELL was bribed by the Whigs to urge on the question of a repeal of

the union. This astonished me very much, knowing how good a man and how sound a politician General COCKBURN is. In consequence of which the General has written to me to say, that the passage was *wholly ironical*, and that he was far from believing any such thing. I believe him most sincerely; and am very glad that he has furnished me with an opportunity of correcting a passage in his letter calculated to give great pain to so many good men.

HISTORY OF GEORGE THE FOURTH.

Two numbers of this work will be published on the 1. of next month, and three numbers on the 1. of August; and this will complete the work, chronological table, index, and all; and then I shall have done my duty with regard to "THE SOVEREIGN," and his fishings on VIRGINIA Water; and his palaces and his gateways, and his pony phaetons, and his gilded carpets, so much admired and praised by the ever-damned tax-devourers of London. Ah! this is the solace of my life, to look back at, and to describe how it is, that the greedy and blundering fellows, who have had the affairs of this nation in their hands, have brought themselves into their present pretty pickle. I have just finished the history of PEEL'S bill. I lose myself in ecstasy, when I look back at their arrogance and insolence, and then turn my eyes to behold them in their present precious plight, in which they are now receiving the just reward of that arrogance and insolence; and there is no part of them, whose present situation I view with more pleasure than that of the parsons.

SCOTCH POOR-LAWS.

As we are going to make the labourers of England as happy and as well off as those in Scotland, by taking from them their right to relief, it may not be amiss to hear from Scotch ploughmen their own account of their own situation. I have no doubt but they have

been stirred up by the discussions which have taken place on this subject. That which is now passing in Parliament is read in the Isle of SKY, and in the ORKNEYS; and I should not be at all surprised if this attempt to extinguish the glorious poor-laws of England were to extend them to Scotland and Ireland. The matter will be now *understood*, and that is a great thing. I recommend the perusal of this article to all my readers, and particularly to Mr. HUME.

(From the Glasgow Chronicle, 16 June.)

A public meeting of the ploughmen of the Carse of Gowrie was held on the 5. instant, at Inchtute, (it being the most central place in the district), for the purpose of forming an association to procure a reduction in their hours of labour. A band of music was in attendance. A series of resolutions were passed to the effect, that from and after Martinmas next, the regular hours of working shall be ten hours per day in summer and eight in winter; but that in seed time, hay time, and harvest, they shall work additional hours, to be paid for such additional hours at the rate of day labourers. The meeting was addressed at considerable length by several individuals, all ploughmen. James Beg, in depicting the toils and hardships to which ploughmen were subjected, said that the ploughmen of the Carse of Gowrie worked twice as much as the negroes in the West Indies. Another speaker imputed the evils to which the ploughmen and their employers, the farmers, as well as the manufacturing operatives were subjected, to the present corn-laws, and maintained that the lairds were the only gainers by these laws. After stating the expectations formed by the farmers of what would be the result of the corn-laws, in keeping up the price of corn, he proceeded as follows: They, therefore, took farms at a rent that required these prices, before they could pay it. The prices, however, fell much lower: at present wheat does not exceed 50s. per quarter. Your masters, the farmers, are thus rushing rapidly into ruin, and vainly

strive to save themselves a little by keeping you too many hours at work. You must, however, have at them. If they complain of poverty, tell them you cannot help that; they must insist for a reduction of rent from the laird; that you have submitted too long to an almost unprecedented toil and poverty; and that it would be a blessing for both of you to assist one another in effecting a complete removal of the evil. They will strive to frighten you by speaking of bringing over Irish labourers to fill your places. But I can tell you, that, though they did, they would not keep them three months. (Cheers). They would find they had not the cannibals to deal with; (Cheers); they would find they had got as ugly customers as the sick burners of England. (Great cheering). The meeting, which consisted of upwards of six hundred persons, all more or less connected with agricultural labour, separated in the greatest order, after appointing a committee to make arrangements for carrying their views into effect.

A BILL FOR THE AMENDMENT AND BETTER ADMINISTRATION OF THE LAWS RELATING TO THE POOR IN ENGLAND AND WALES.

[Note.—The words printed in *italics* are proposed to be inserted in the committee.]

(Concluded from p. 697.)

And be it further enacted, That in case any overseer, assistant overseer, master of a work-house, or other officer of any parish or union, shall refuse or wilfully neglect to aid and assist the guardians of such parish or union, or shall disobey their reasonable orders in carrying the lawful rules, orders and regulations of the said commissioners or assistant commissioners or the provisions of this act into execution, every such offender shall, upon conviction before any *two* justices, forfeit and pay for every such offence any sum not exceeding *five* pounds.

And be it further enacted, That if any overseer, assistant overseer, master of a work-house, or other paid officer, or any other person employed by or under the authority of the said guardians shall purloin, embezzle or wilfully waste or misapply any of the monies, goods or chattels belonging to any parish or union, every such offender shall, upon conviction before any *two* justices, forfeit and pay for every such offence any sum not exceeding

twenty pounds, and also *treble* the amount or value of such money, goods or chattels so purloined, embezzled, wasted or misapplied, and every person so convicted shall be for ever thereafter incapable of serving any office under the provisions of this or any other act in relation to the relief of the poor.

And be it further enacted, That in case any person shall wilfully neglect or disobey any of the lawful rules, orders or regulations of the said commissioners or assistant commissioners, such person shall, upon conviction before any *two* justices, forfeit and pay for the first offence any sum not exceeding *five* pounds; for the second offence any sum not exceeding *twenty* pounds nor less than *five* pounds; and in the event of such person being convicted a third time, such third and every subsequent offence shall be deemed a *misdemeanor*, and such offender shall be liable to be indicted for the same offence, and shall on conviction pay such fine, not being less than *twenty* pounds, and suffer such imprisonment as may be awarded against him by the court by or before which he shall be tried and convicted.

And be it further enacted, That all penalties and forfeitures by this act inflicted or authorized to be imposed for any offence against the same shall, upon proof and conviction of the offences respectively before any *two* justices, either by the confession of the party offending, or by the oath of any creditable witness or witnesses, (which oath such justices are in every case hereby fully authorized to administer), or upon order made as aforesaid, be levied, together with the costs attending the information, summonses, and conviction, by distress and sale of the goods and chattels, of the offender, or person liable or ordered to pay the same respectively, by warrant under the hands of the justices before whom the party may have been convicted, (which warrant such justices are hereby empowered and required to grant), and the overplus (if any) after such penalties and forfeitures, and the charges of such distress and sale, are deducted, shall be returned, upon demand, unto the owner or owners of such goods and chattels; and in case such fines, penalties and forfeitures shall not be forthwith paid upon conviction, then it shall be lawful for such justices as aforesaid, to order the offender or offenders so convicted to be detained and kept in safe custody until return can be conveniently made to such warrant of distress, unless the offender or offenders shall give sufficient security to the satisfaction of such justices as aforesaid, for his or their appearance before such justices on such day or days as shall be appointed for the return of such warrant of distress, such day or days not being more than *seven* days from the time of taking any such security, and which security the said justices as aforesaid are hereby empowered to take by way of recognizance or otherwise; but if upon the return of such warrant it shall appear that no sufficient distress can be had thereupon, then it shall be lawful for

any such justices as aforesaid, as the case may be, and they are hereby authorized and required, by warrant or warrants under their hands, to cause such offender or offenders to be committed to the common Jail or House of Correction of the county, riding or place where the offender shall be or reside, there to remain without bail or mainprize for any term not exceeding *three* calendar months, unless such penalties and forfeitures, and all reasonable charges attending the same, shall be sooner paid and satisfied; and the penalties and forfeitures when so levied shall be paid to or for the use of the parish or union where such offence shall have been committed, to be applied in aid of the poor-rate of such parish or union.

And be it further enacted, That in all cases in which any penalty or forfeiture is recoverable before the justices of the peace under this act, it shall and may be lawful for any commissioner or assistant commissioner, or any justice, to whom complaint shall be made of any such offence, to summon the party complained against to appear before any *two* justices, and on such summons the said *two* justices may hear and determine the matter of such complaint, and on proof of the offence, convict the offender, and adjudge him to pay the penalty or forfeiture incurred, and proceed to recover the same, although no information in writing shall have been exhibited or taken by or before such justices; and all such proceedings by summons without information shall be as good, valid and effectual to all intents and purposes as if an information in writing had been exhibited.

And be it further enacted, That where any distress shall be made for any sum of money to be levied by virtue of this act, the distress itself shall not be deemed unlawful, nor the party making the same be deemed a trespasser, on account of any default or want of form in any proceedings relating thereto, nor shall the party distraining be deemed a trespasser ab initio on account of any irregularity which shall afterwards happen in making the distress, but the person aggrieved by such irregularity may recover full satisfaction for the special damage in an action on the case: Provided always, that no plaintiff shall recover in any action for any irregularity, trespass or wrongful proceedings, if tender of sufficient amends shall be made, by or on behalf of the party who shall have committed or caused to be committed any such irregularity, trespass or wrongful proceedings, before such action shall have been brought; and in case no such tender shall have been made, it shall and may be lawful for the defendant in any such action, by leave of the court where such action shall depend, at any time before issue joined, to pay into court such sum of money as he shall see fit, whereupon such proceedings, or orders and judgment shall be had, made and given in and by such court as in other actions where the defendant is allowed to pay money into court.

Provided also, and be it further enacted, That if any person or persons shall find himself, herself or themselves aggrieved by any order or conviction of any justice or justices, where such person or persons shall be convicted in any penalty or penalties exceeding *five* pounds, it shall be lawful for such person or persons to appeal to any general or quarter sessions of the peace to be held in and for the county, riding or division in which such order shall have been made or conviction taken place, within *four* calendar months next after the cause of complaint shall have arisen, or if such sessions shall be held before the expiration of *one* calendar month next after such cause of complaint, then such appeal shall be made to the next following sessions, either of which court of sessions is hereby empowered to hear and finally determine the matter of the said appeal, and to make such order therein as to them shall seem meet, which order shall be final and conclusive to and upon all parties; provided that the person or persons so appealing shall give, or cause to be given, at least *fourteen* days' notice in writing of his, her or their intention of appealing as aforesaid, and of the matter or cause thereof, to the respondent or respondents, and within *five* days after such notice, shall enter into a recognizance, before some justice of the peace, with sufficient securities, conditioned to try such appeal at the then next general sessions or quarter sessions of the peace, which shall first happen, and to abide the order of and pay such costs as shall be awarded by the justices at such quarter sessions, or any adjournment thereof; and such justices, upon hearing and finally determining such matter of appeal, shall and may, according to their discretion, award such costs to the party appealing, or appealed against, as they shall think proper; and their determination in or concerning the premises shall be conclusive and binding on all parties to all intents and purposes whatsoever.

And be it further enacted, That no action or suit shall be commenced against any commissioner, assistant commissioner, or any other person for any thing done in pursuance of or under the authority of this act until *twenty-one* days' notice has been given thereof in writing to the party or person against whom such action is intended to be brought, nor after sufficient satisfaction or tender thereof shall have been made to the party aggrieved, nor after *three* calendar months next after the act committed for which such action shall be so brought; and every such action shall be brought, laid, and tried, where the cause of action shall have arisen, and not in any other county or place; and the defendant in such action or suit may plead the general issue, and give this act and any special matter in evidence at any trial which shall be had thereupon; and if the matter or thing shall appear to have been done under or by virtue of this act, or if it shall appear that such action or suit was brought before *twenty-one*

days' notice thereof, given as aforesaid, or that sufficient satisfaction was made or tendered as aforesaid, or if any action or suit shall not be commenced within the time before limited, or shall be laid in any other county than as aforesaid, then the jury shall find a verdict for the defendant therein; and if a verdict shall be found for such defendant, or if the plaintiff in such action or suit shall become nonsuit, or suffer a discontinuance of such action, or if, upon any demurrer in such action, judgment shall be given for the defendant therein, then and in any of the cases aforesaid such defendant shall have costs as between attorney and client, and shall have such remedy for recovering the same as any defendant may have for his or her costs in any other case by law.

And be it further enacted, That in the construction of this act,

The word "auditor" shall be construed to mean and include every person, other than justices of the peace acting in virtue of their office, appointed or empowered to audit, control, examine, allow or disallow the accounts of any guardian, overseer or vestrymen relating to the receipt or expenditure of the poor-rate:

The words "general rule" shall be construed to mean any rule relating to the management of the poor, or to the execution of this act, which shall be addressed by the said commissioners to more than one union, or to more parishes or places than one not forming a union, or not to be formed into or added to a union under or by virtue of such rule:

The word "guardian" shall be construed to mean and include any visiter, governor, director, manager, acting guardian, or other officer in a parish or union, appointed or entitled to act as a manager of the poor, and in the distribution or ordering of relief to the poor from the poor-rate, under any general or local act of parliament:

The word "justice" shall be construed to mean justice of the peace, and to include justices of the peace of any division of a county, riding, borough, liberty, division of a liberty, precinct, county of a city, county of a town, cinque port, or town corporate:

The word "oath" shall be construed to include the affirmation of a Quaker, Separatist or Moravian:

The words "orders and regulations" shall be construed to mean and include any rule, order, regulation or by-law relating to the management or relief of the poor, or the execution of this act, which shall be addressed, directed or applied to any one parish or union, or to any number of parishes which have been or by virtue of any order shall be constituted a union, or added to a union:

The word "overseer" shall be construed to mean and include overseers of the poor,

churchwardens, so far as they are authorized or required by law to act in the management or relief of the poor, or in the collection or distribution of the poor-rate, assistant overseer, or any other subordinate officer, whether paid or unpaid, in any parish or union, who shall be employed therein in carrying this act or the laws for the relief of the poor into execution :

The word "owner" shall be construed to include any person for the time being in possession of any property rateable to the relief of the poor, and not let at rack-rent, or receiving the rack-rent of any such property, either on his own account or as trustee, agent or receiver of any other person entitled to receive the same, or as mortgagee or other encumbrancer in possession ; and the words "rack rent" shall be construed to mean any rent which shall not be less than two-thirds of the full improved net value of any property :

The word "parish" shall be construed to include any parish, city, borough, town, township, liberty, precinct, vill, village, hamlet, tithing, chapelry, or any other place, or division or district of a place, maintaining its own poor, whether parochial or extra-parochial :

The word "person" shall be construed to include any body politic corporate or collegiate, aggregate or sole, as well as any individual :

The word "poor" shall be construed to include any pauper or poor or indigent person applying for or receiving relief from the poor-rate in England or Wales, or chargeable thereto :

The words "poor-law," or "laws for the relief of the poor," shall be construed to include every act of parliament for the time being in force, and not at variance with the provisions of this act, for the relief or management of the poor, or relating to the execution of the same, or the administration of such relief :

The words "poor-rate" shall be construed to include any rate, rate in aid, mulct, cess, assessment, collection, levy, ley, subscription, or contribution, raised, assessed, imposed, levied, collected or disbursed for the relief of the poor in any parish or union :

The word "union" shall be construed to include any number of parishes united for any purpose whatever under the provisions of this act, or incorporated under the said act made and passed in the twenty-second year of his late Majesty King George the Third, intituled, "An Act for the better Relief and Employment of the Poor," or incorporated for the relief or maintenance of the poor under any local act :

The words "united workhouse" shall be construed to mean and include any workhouse of a union :

The word "vestry" shall be construed to mean any open, customary or select vestry, or any meeting of inhabitants convened by any notice such as would have been required for the assembling of a meeting in vestry, at which meeting any business relating to the poor or the poor-rate shall be transacted or taken into consideration, so far as such business is concerned :

The word "workhouse" shall be construed to include any house or building purchased, erected, hired, or used at the expense of the poor-rate, by any parish, vestry, guardian, or overseer, for the reception, employment, classification, or relief of any poor person therein at the expense of such parish :

And wherever in this act, in describing any person or party, matter or thing, the word importing the singular number or the masculine gender only is used, the same shall be understood to include and shall be applied to several persons or parties as well as one person or party, and females as well as males, and several matters or things as well as one matter or thing respectively, unless there be something in the subject or context repugnant to such construction.

And be it further enacted, That this act may be altered, amended or repealed in this present session of Parliament.

RIGHTS OF THE POOR.

I RE-PUBLISH the following from the Introduction of the second part, or second volume of my HISTORY of the PROTESTANT REFORMATION. The resolution moved in the House of Commons by me, on Monday night, was founded upon the matter contained in the extract, which I am now about to give, and to which I beseech the undivided attention of the reader. He will here find every thing that is required fully to justify that resolution ; and it is my firm conviction that a law will be passed consonant with that resolution, at no very distant day.

1. The foregoing PART of this work contains the History of the Protestant "Reformation," the object of which was to show, and, I trust, it has shown most clearly, that that event "has impoverished and degraded the main body of the people." In speaking of the motives to the producing of the event, I said, that a fair and honest inquiry would teach us, that the chief of those motives was PLUNDER. The inquiry was fair and honest, and it has taught to every reader, that plunder was the main object, and, indeed, the

only object, with all the most active, and the most powerful, of the actors in that drama of devastation. The chief object of the present little volume is to show, as far as my means will enable me, the enormous extent and amount of that plunder.

2. To this end I here present to the reader the LIST, which is described in the title-page, but which stands in need of those short explanations which I am now about to give; and, when I have given which, I shall add some observations, which, while they are suggested by bare justice to our well-fed and well-clad Catholic forefathers, are, as the reader will see, imperiously demanded at my hands by mercy to ourselves, their unfortunate, half-famished, ragged, pauperized descendants.

3. The EXPLANATIONS, to which I have alluded in the last paragraph, relate chiefly to the arrangement of the several articles in the list. The order is alphabetical throughout, except that WALES follows ENGLAND, leaving IRELAND to come last. The list, for England, begins, of course, with *Bedfordshire*, and ends with *Yorkshire*. Then, under the name of each county, the order is alphabetical again: the list for *Bedfordshire*, for instance, beginning with *Bedford*, and ending with *Woburn*.

4. In each article I have given, as far as my materials would enable me, 1. A description of the nature of the foundation; 2. The name of the founder; 3. The date of the foundation; 4. The estimated yearly value at the time of the confiscation by Henry VIII.; 5. The present yearly value, according to the change in the value of money; 6. By what king, or queen, the property was granted away; 7. To whom it was granted. I will here give a specimen in the article just mentioned. "At *Woburn*. A Cistercian Abbey, founded near this place, in the year 1145, by Hugh de Bolebec. Valued at 430*l.* 1*s.* 11*d.*, now worth 8,613*l.* 1*s.* 2*d.* Granted, 1 Edward VI., to John Lord Russell."

5. Alas! when the Russells were hunting the poor Catholics about, in the reign of Charles II., I wonder whether they ever thought of pious and generous Hugh de Bolebec! Bishop TANNER tells us, that this grant was made to Russell in the first year of Edward VI.; Doctor HEYLIN tells us that the people of Devonshire rose, in the second year of Edward VI., and, amongst other things, demanded that some of the monasteries should be re-established; and HUME tells us, that they were, at last, quelled, and punished by martial law, by Lord RUSSELL, aided by German troops! Alas! and poor Hugh de Bolebec never thought of all the while, I would almost be sworn!

6. The whole of the articles are not so perfect in their information as is the one above cited. In some the name of the grantee has not been to be come at; in others the valuation is not recorded; in others the name of the founder is wanting; and, with regard to Ire-

land, the information is still more scanty, and that, too, in every respect, and in a very great degree. Nevertheless the LIST, taken altogether, is, I trust it will be thought, a very interesting historical and statistical document, and will be found very commodious as a work of reference; for, if you see, or hear of, any ancient foundation, in any part of the kingdom, and wish to know *what it was*, and when *it arose*, how it was *put down*, and *who got it*; knowing in *what county* it is, you turn to the county, which you will find in the order of the alphabet. Then, knowing in or near what city, town, or village it is, you turn, according to the alphabet, to the city, town, or village; or, to the usual name of the abbey, priory, or other foundation. Thus you, with as little inconvenience as possible, get at the best information that I have been able to give.

7. But, it is in the mass, it is as the ground of a general conclusion, that the contents of this volume, are of the greatest importance. Here are about two hundred pages of close print filled with a bare list of pieces of once public property, now worth from one hundred pounds to upwards of fifty thousand pounds a year each? Some few of the things in the list, as in the cases of several of the colleges, chapters, hospitals, and other foundations, still continue to be public property; but, these form but a comparatively small part of the general mass; and there is, after all, wholly left out of the list, the numerous private estates seized on and granted away by the "Reformation" sovereigns, in virtue of acts of attainder and other means, grounded on the adherence of the owners to the religion of their fathers. As, for instance, estates like that of which COWDRY-HOUSE, in Sussex, was the chief seat, and which was seized on by Henry VIII., in virtue of the attainder of the Countess of Salisbury and her heirs, and granted by him to his physician, Sir ANTHONY BROWN, who obtained, from that execrable tyrant, manors and estates running over a considerable part of the north-west of Sussex and of the south-west of Surrey.

8. Besides the public property described in this list, there were the tithes, which were thus seized on and granted away to lay persons by the "Protestant Reformation" sovereigns. Until that event took place, no man had an idea, that it could be possible for tithes to be claimed by any but those who administered religion. But, it was soon found, that a large part of those tithes, the sole objects of which were the promotion of religion, and the relief of the poor and the stranger, had, all at once, by a mere touch of the Protestant wand, been converted into estates for the already nobles and rich men. Such they continue to this day; and, hence those monstrous things, called lay-impropriations, giving, in many cases, thousands of pounds a year to a layman, who never sees the parish, and a few pounds a year to a clergyman who does whatever clerical duty is done in that same parish.

The whole affair was a real *taking away from the middle and lower classes, and a giving to the nobles and the rich*. Yet are there men so blind, or so perverse, as to think, or to pretend to think, that the thing, called the "Reformation," ought to be looked upon as "*a blessing*."

9. The whole of the rents of the estates of the church, including those tithes which were confiscated and transferred to lay-parsons, amounted to, perhaps, *a third part of the whole rental of the kingdom*. There are no means of knowing what the amount really was; for the *valuation* was, in fact, no valuation at all. It was all plundering with one hand and squandering with the other, as may well be imagined, when the historians tell us, OLD HARRY (the name which the English gave to the Devil for many years after Old Harry's death, and the name which the Americans give to the devil to this day); when historians tell us that OLD HARRY gave a church-estate to a woman who had *made a pudding to please him*, and that Sir MILES PARTRIDGE won a *ring of church bells* of him at *dice*! It is impossible to come at any thing like an exact account of the worth of the possessions of the Catholic church. Protestant writers have endeavoured to make the church's rental *as great as possible*, in order to exhibit the clergy as monstrous devourers of the national income. According to the *recorded valuations*, the rental did not amount to more than *a tenth* part of the rental of the kingdom. But, then, these valuations were founded, apparently, solely upon the *reserved rents*, leaving out fines, renewals, heriots, deodands and various other sources of income; and, therefore, I agree with those historians, who think that the church income, including the impropriated tithes, amounted to a full third-part of the income of all the landowners (clergy included) in the whole nation.

10. Well, then, the good and thoughtless Protestant, who has been, as I was, duped from infancy to manhood; well, then, such good Protestant will ask: "Was not this a great deal too much to be devoured by a parcel of lazy monks and priests and nuns, who did no work of any kind, who lived but to eat and drink and sleep, and who kept the people in ignorance?" Now, my good brother Protestant, be you who you may, you cannot be more zealous or more loud upon this score than I was, for many years of my life; until I, at last, *examined for myself*, not the pages of lying, hired, place-hunting, pension-hunting, benefice-seeking, or romancing historians; but the pages of the Statute-book and of the books of the ancient laws of my country. This being the case, you are entitled to a patient hearing and a kind answer, from me, to this, your very natural question; a question such as I should, about ten years ago, have been very likely to put myself.

11. Now, then, if the monks and priests and nuns were such *lazy* people; if they

worked neither by hand nor head; if they did nothing but eat, drink and sleep; if this were their real character, and this the habit of their lives, how can you possibly believe, that they had any influence at all over the minds of the people? And, unless they had very great influence over their minds, how can you possibly believe, that they kept the people in ignorance? What, my friend! Were the people susceptible of knowledge? Had they (just as we have) nature's works and laws to enlighten them? Had they a desire to become skilful and learned? And, were they kept in a state of ignorance, were their capacities benumbed, and their propensities thus completely thwarted by *lazy creatures who lived only to eat, drink, and sleep*?

12. By this time, you, I am sure, begin to be ashamed of these assertions; and, the further I go the more fully will you be convinced, that you have been and are, as I formerly was, the dupe of those, who now live upon the spoils of the church of our fathers. Now, then, is it a *fact*, is it *true*, that the Catholic clergy kept, or endeavoured to keep, the people in IGNORANCE? This is a charge that fat and luxurious fellows of the present day are incessantly preferring against them; but, is it not *a false charge*? That it is a false charge you will find proved in the most satisfactory manner, in the first PART of this work, in paragraphs from 28 to 36, and in paragraphs from 129 to 134. But, my friend, look into the *present volume*. Turn over, zealous hater of "monkish ignorance"; turn over to the county of Oxford; then go on to *Oxford city*. Aye! there it is, in that "*learned University*," the colleges of which are all filled with rosy-gilled and most doctor-like Protestants, and the walls of which colleges incessantly ring with abuse poured forth on the Catholic religion, and especially on the clergy of that church, who are here, above all the places in the world, accused of *keeping the people in ignorance*: there it is, surely, that you will, my good Protestant friend, find something in the way of *proof* to make good this accusation! Turn over the leaves, then, and come to the word "OXFORD."

13. What! Aye do! Rub your eyes bright, and then look again. What! nothing at all! Oh! everlasting shame on the name of Protestant! Not one single *college, hall, or school*, founded by Protestants, nor since the day that the word Protestant was pronounced in England! About twenty colleges in all, and all founded and endowed by Catholics; and, as if to put the calumniators of the Catholic clergy to shame eternal, as if to make them undergo a sort of hell in this world, out of the twenty, *eleven* were founded by CATHOLIC BISHOPS; *two* by MONKS; *one* by NUNS; and *five* by Catholic kings, nobles, gentlemen, and ladies. Aye, and here is the record, that the *University* itself was founded by ALFRED, whose father took him to Rome, where he was anointed by the Pope himself! Nay, as if all

this were not enough, here is the record, that the teaching at this University was *begun by a monk*, who came to England for the express purpose, and in gratitude for the services of whom Alfred founded and endowed a monastery for him at Winchester.

14. Thus, then, my good and true Protestant friend, we have, I think, settled the question about *keeping the people in ignorance*. We now come to the other assertion which is put forth by you, namely, that this full third part of the rents of the nation "was a great deal too much to be devoured by the monks and priests and nuns," and which you have, as I used to do, repeated out of the books of the really devouring vermin of the present day. Yes, it was "a great deal too much to be so devoured"; but, then, my friend, you are not yet aware, that your basis is an *assumed* fact; and that this assumed fact is a *most monstrous lie*! In the first place it was physically impossible that they should *devour* a fiftieth part of it. How, for instance, were the fourteen monks in the Abbey of Chertsey, in Surrey, to devour rents, which, in our money, amounted to 14,893*l.* a year? BISHOP TANNER (a Protestant bishop, mind), says, that "all the monasteries were, in effect, great schools and great hospitals (meaning, in those days, places of hospitality); and were, many of them, obliged to relieve many poor people every day. They were likewise houses of entertainment for almost all travellers. In short, their hospitality was such, that, in the Priory of Norwich, *one thousand five hundred quarters of malt, and above eight hundred quarters of wheat, and all other things in proportion, were generally spent every year.*"

15. There! my good duped Protestant friend; that is the way, in which monks and nuns "devoured" their rents! There were but 22 monks in this Priory; so that, in fact, they were the mere agents for distributing amongst the needy and the strangers the rents of their estates. Ah! Good God! what has the thing called the "Reformation" produced at Norwich! Who is there at Norwich NOW to keep *hospitality*? "ST. ANDREW'S HALL," as it is now called, which was the church of this Priory, is the *Corn-Market*, and now hears, instead of the chantings of its benevolent monks, the chafferings and the cheapenings, the lying and roguish cant, of sly Quaker corn-monopolizers. The questions here now are, not how and when malt and wheat shall be distributed to the poor and the stranger; but, how they shall be hoarded up, made dear, and kept from the thirsty and the hungry. It was from the platform, on which once stood the high-altar of this Priory, that I tendered to the people of Norfolk, *that Petition*, which they did me the honour to pass, which was afterwards presented to the Parliament, which now lies on the table of the House of Commons, and which is, I trust, destined finally to be the ground-work of measures, calculated, not, certainly, to restore to us the happiness enjoyed by our Catholic fathers, but to take

away by law, and to *give back to the poor*, a part, at least, of those church-revenues, which, in Catholic times, were deemed to be, and actually were, the inheritance of the poor and the stranger; for, this is the grand thing for which that *Petition* prays; and, certainly, if the spot from which it sprang could be supposed capable of giving it any degree of effect, one more appropriate than the altar-base of this munificent Priory could not have been chosen.

16. Yes, my good and duped Protestant friend, "a great deal too much to be devoured by monks and priests and nuns"; and, accordingly, the monks and nuns did not, as you have seen, *devour* it, nor hardly any part of it. And now, as to the *priests*, including the bishops. They could not marry; they could have no wives; they had, in fact, no families to provide for; while, as to the monks and nuns, they could possess no private property, could leave nothing by will, and, therefore, were completely trustees for the poor and the stranger. Of the manner, in which the bishops spent their incomes, we have a *specimen* in the *eleven Colleges*, out of twenty, founded and endowed by them at Oxford. But the main thing of all is, that the Catholic priesthood, taken altogether, *wholly maintained the poor and the stranger*, and suffered not the name of *pauper* to be known in England; and, it never was known in England, until the thing, called the "Reformation," came.

17. This is a matter, which is, *at this time* (July 1827) of infinite importance. In the *Norfolk Petition*, before mentioned, we prayed, that "a part of the public property, *commonly called church property*," might be *taken away by law*, and applied to *other public purposes*. My anxious wish, and my *hope* is, that the prayer of this petition may finally be granted by the Parliament; whether before the Parliament be reformed, I cannot say; but, granted it will be, in the end, I have no doubt; and, with this in my mind it is, that I put forth this little volume, the utility of which, in the case thus hoped for, we shall presently see. But, first we ought to consider a little the *origin* of this "*church property*," as it is now called, and as it never was called, and as no one ever presumed to call it, until it had the name given it by Protestant priests and bishops, when they once got it into their hands. It was, in fact, the portion of the poor, the infirm, the aged, the widow, the orphan, the stranger, and of all the necessitous, which portion was lodged in the hands of the clergy for just and wise distribution.

18. In the first PART of this Work, in paragraphs from 49 to 59 inclusive, this matter is fully and clearly stated. To those paragraphs I beg to refer the reader. There it is clearly shown, that *tithes*, and *every other species* of income of the clergy, were looked upon, and were, in fact and in practice, more the *property of the poor* than of the monks, nuns, priests, and bishops. Thus it was that there were, in this then happy country, neither

paupers nor common beggars. But, when a part of the tithes and estates had been seized and taken away from the clergy altogether, and when the remainder had been given to bishops and priests, who were allowed to marry, and who, of course, had families of their own to feed and clothe and to get fortunes for, the beggars, as we have seen in PART FIRST, paragraphs 470 and 471, began to appear, and they soon "covered the land," as the lice did the land of Egypt. Attempts were, as we have there seen, made to keep down their numbers by punishments the most horrible; so that England, which had never before known what poverty was, now saw it in all its most hideous forms.

19. At last, when the butchering and racking Elizabeth had tried whipping, scourging, and even *martial law*, in vain, and when she and the principal plunderers began to fear that raging hunger would, if not by some means or other assuaged, deal them deadly blows; then, and not till then, the POOR-LAWS were passed; and this fruit of the famous "Reformation" sticks to the land-owners, clings fast to them, unto the present day. The real history of the poor-rates and of English pauperism is given Part I., paragraphs from 227 to 237, and in paragraphs from 456 to 477. And we are always to bear in mind, that the money, or food, or clothing, proceeding from the poor-rates, is the *poor's property*. It is not *alms*; it is what they have a right to by the *law of nature*, by the *law of God*, and by the *common law of the land*; aye, that same law which, and which *alone*, gives a man a right to the enjoyment of his field or his garden, also gives the poor and necessitous a right to be relieved out of the fruits of the earth.

20. *Civil society* it was that caused that which is called *private property*. In a state of nature, when man was and the lands were as God made them and left them, the lands were for the common use of all the people. When the people of any country agreed to give up their common right, and to permit private ownership to exist, they must have done it with a view to make their lives *safer* and *happier*; and therefore it is *impossible*, it is absolutely impossible, that they could have contemplated as a consequence of their social compact, that the lives of the *millions* would ever be placed at the mere mercy of the *thousands*, or perhaps of the *hundreds*. MALTHUS denies the right of the poor to relief; he denies that they have any *right* to claim relief from those who hold the lands and houses as their private property; and he actually recommends to the Parliament to be so foolish as well as so unjust and cruel as to *pass a law* to refuse relief to *all who shall be born after a certain day*, and also to *all the parents of such persons*. In the way of *justification* of this horrid proposal he says, that the man wanting relief after this "should be left to the *punishment of nature*"; that he should be told that the "*laws of nature had doomed him and his fa-*

mily to starve"; and that, whatever might be their state of distress, "*they had no claim on society for the smallest portion of food*"! I need hardly say, that this came from the pen of a *church of England parson*! Arrogant, insolent, stupid, and cruel as it is, its source will be a question of doubt with few men.

21. To the "*punishment of nature*" this stupid and cruel projector would leave the necessitous. Well, parson, the poor would, I dare say, take you at your word, and jump for joy to be thus referred to the *laws of nature*. Those laws, parson, bid them, when they want food, to take it where they can find it, and to care nothing about the place or the person that they take it from. The laws of nature know nothing about *theft* or *robbery* or *burglary*. When, indeed, in no shop, house, barn, mill, or other place, the hungry man can *discover* food sufficient to satisfy his hunger; or, when finding it, he has not, whether by force of arms or otherwise, the *ability* to get at it and eat it; then, indeed, I allow, that "*the laws of nature have doomed him to starve*"; but, parson, it is only when he cannot discover the existence of food, or when, knowing where it is, he has not force to seize it, that the "*laws of nature doom him to starve*."

22. We very well know, that all men are subject, and ought to be subject, as I have, on more than one occasion, before stated, to be called forth, to be compelled to come forth, and, at the risk of their lives, defend their country against a foreign enemy, and also to defend the lands or houses, which are the private property of the possessors, in case of any illegal attempt to take away, or to injure, those lands or houses. Now, suppose the country invaded, or suppose a band of rebels to be gutting, or pulling down, the house of a lord. Suppose PARSON MALTHUS to go to a poor man, to whom he has been before preaching his doctrine; and suppose him to call upon this man to come forth, as a *militia-man*, to repel the invaders, or to quell the rebels.

PARSON.—Here, CHOPSTICK! Come away, and bring your arms to defend your country.

CHOPSTICK.—My country, Parson; how is it *mine*, if I have not in it even a security against being starved to death while the land abounds in food?

PARSON.—But, here is the *law*, and forth you must come, or be punished severely.

CHOPSTICK.—Law, why the *law of nature* bids me, first, not to risk my life; next, it bids me to stay at home in these times of peril, to quiet the alarms of, and to protect, my wife and children.

PARSON.—But, here are a parcel of rebels, gutting and pulling down the good Lord Rottenborough's house.

CHOPSTICK.—Well! Let him drive them away.

PARSON.—But, he cannot; he is not able; one man cannot fight with a thousand; and the *law* commands us to come forth to the protection of each other.

[Enter OVERSEER.]

CHOPSTICK.—Law! Oh, no, Parson, the *law of nature* bids the *strong* to do what they please with that which the *weak* have got; that law bids these strong poor men to go and take the goods and to pull down and divide amongst them the big house of this rich weak man; and, if I be to be referred to that law, when I and my wife and children are starving for want of relief; if the overseer be to answer my application by telling me, “that the law of nature has *doomed us to starve*,” surely I may refer my lord to the sentences of the same law.

OVERSEER.—Why, John, who has been filling thy head with this nonsense? When did I talk to you about the *law of nature*? Are there not the *poor-laws* to provide for you, in case of distress; and do you not, in this way, partake in the yearly rents, and, in fact, in the ownership, of my lord's estate.

[Exit PARSON, slipping off.]

CHOPSTICK.—Aye! That's another man's matter, Master Pinchum! Then, indeed, if I be a sort of part owner with my lord, it is just that I should [*taking a club down from the rack*] go and fight for the protection of his goods and his house; and here I go to do my best against these rebels.

23. This is the true, the common-sense, view of the matter. Agreeably to these principles there are, and always have been, in all countries, except in ill-fated Ireland since the “Reformation,” a legal provision, of some sort or other, for the necessitous; a law, of some sort, that effectually provided, that they should not die for want of food and raiment; and, though, in England, many attempts have been made, by STURGES and others, to alter the law in such a way as to make it more and more difficult for the indigent to obtain relief; though attempts of this sort are continually making; they never can, upon the whole, be attended with success; for, before they could obtain that success, the kingdom would be convulsed to its centre; and, indeed, it is clear to every man of sense and reflection, that it is the poor-rates, and the poor-rates alone, which, at this very moment, cause the peace of the country to be preserved.

24. But, though these rates are just and necessary, we are never to forget, that they were not at all necessary, that they never existed, and that the hateful name of *pauper* never was known in England, until that “Reformation,” as it is called, which caused the enormous confiscations, the particulars of which are stated in this second part of my history. Before that time, the indigent were relieved out of the produce of the *tithes*, out of the revenues of the monasteries, and out of those of the manors and other estates of the bishops. We have seen, in the first part of this work, how a large part of the *tithes* and almost all the revenues of the monasteries were alienated from the *poor* and from the *public*, and in what manner they became pri-

vate property. As to the *poor*, they, after about fifty years of whipping, branding, iron-collaring, shooting, and hanging, got a provision, such as it was, in the *poor-rates*; but, observe, the *public* got no compensation for what the aristocracy had taken from it; and every man had now, if not a pauper himself, to pay poor-rates, to make up for what the aristocracy had got divided amongst them!

25. A pretty large part of the tithes and of the manors and the other estates belonging to the bishops, the cathedrals, and the colleges, remained unconfiscated, and were turned over to the Protestant parsons, bishops, deans, prebendaries, fellows of colleges, and other “*spiritual persons*” (as the law calls them) of the present “Protestant church of England, as by law established.” Now, it is a clear case, that the Parliament, which could take this property from the clergy of one religion, and give it to those of another religion; the Parliament that could, in spite of Magna Charta and in spite of the law of the land of a thousand years standing, do this, though, in doing this the Parliament set at nought the wills, or grants, of all the founders of the numerous religious houses and establishments; it is a clear case, that all those who contend, that the Parliament had a right to do these things, must allow, that the Parliament has a right to dispose as it pleases of all that part of the church property, which still continues to belong to the nation, or in other words, which is not private property. The divers religious foundations were made agreeably to the law. If the religion was to be changed, and a new one was to be established, the property in the foundations ought, in justice, in bare justice, to have reverted to the founders, or to their heirs, who, in most cases, were to be found, and were ready to put forward their claim to it. If the religion were found to be bad, the property, the lands, the trees, and the buildings, had committed no offence. Nevertheless, the property was all seized on by the King and Parliament. The Parliament gave it all to the King; and the King, and his successors, gave the greater part of it, in return, amongst the members of the two Houses of Parliament, or their relations! Now, if the King and Parliament had a right to deal thus with property, the heirs of the founders of which were ready to claim it, surely no one can deny, that the present King and Parliament have a right to apply to public purposes that part of this great mass of property, which, as stated above, continues to be the property of the public. There is, I venture to assert, no man that will deny this, and especially no man, who possesses, by descent or otherwise, any part of the Catholic church estates; for, what title has such a man to his estate? What plea has he against an ejectment? He has no title, he has no answer, except those which are furnished by those Acts of Parliament of Henry VIII., which seized, and granted to the King, the estates of the church. This sauce for the goose, so delicious as it

long has been acknowledged to be, must, when the time for another repast shall arrive, be allowed to be sauce for the gander; and, of this sauce Norfolk-petition would, if acted upon, give the nation a taste.

26. PLUNKETT, who has now been made a lord, and about whom the bleaters in Ireland are, just now, making such a fuss, asserted, in the debate on Mr. HUME's motion for applying part of the clerical incomes in Ireland to other public purposes; this PLUNKETT asserted, in the most unqualified terms, that all *tithes, glebes, and all sorts of property, called church property, were as sacred from the touch of the Parliament, that the Parliament had not more right to sell them, or to apply them in any way, than it had to sell, or otherwise dispose of, any parcel of any man's private property!* Indeed, Plunkett! What, then, are any of those titles good for, by which men now hold the immense masses of property described in this volume? If this King and Parliament have *no right* to touch that which *belongs to the nation*, could Harry VIII. and his Parliament have a right to seize and to alienate all these masses of property, great part of which were really *private property*, and had claimants, legal claimants, to demand them? If this King and Parliament have *no right* to take *public property*, and to apply it to *public purposes*, can those titles be worth one single straw, which rest on Acts of Parliament, which Acts seized on *private property* and applied it to *private purposes*? I might, by comparing the tenure of what the church parsons hold with the tenure of private property, show the gross absurdity of the doctrine of this Plunkett, who, I recollect, was anxious to *check* the circulation of small pamphlets, *because the mass of the people were now become so much more enlightened than formerly*; I might, by the comparison just mentioned, show the monstrous absurdity of the doctrine of this Plunkett: but, I say, no: I say, let this doctrine stand, if the parsons like; and, then, all the titles of all the holders of abbey-lands, aye, and of the greater part of the cathedral and college-lands, are not worth one single pinch even of Scotch snuff.

27. However, as there certainly is not a man in the kingdom (except some parson, perhaps), besides PLUNKETT, to hold a doctrine like this, we will leave PLUNKETT to have his hearing faculties tickled by the bleaters of Ireland, and will now go on to see a little how, if applied to this mass of "public property commonly called church-property," Norfolk-petition would work.

28. The property which remains to the nation is, I. THE PAROCHIAL TITHES AND GLEBES. II. THE BISHOPRIC REVENUES. III. THE DEAN AND CHAPTER REVENUES. IV. THE COLLEGE REVENUES. Here is still an immense mass of property, and all of it, or nearly all of it, diverted from the uses to which it was formerly applied, and to which it

was intended that it should always be applied. But the questions for us here are, whether it be now *well applied*; and whether it could not be much *better applied* than it now is. As to the *real amount* of it, that will never be got at by the public, as long as it shall remain in the hands in which it now is. No man has ever been able to get an account laid before Parliament, of the amount of *this property!* Accounts of *every thing else* can be got; but, of this no account can ever be come at. Some years ago, a return was made to Parliament, stating, the *name* of each living, the *population* of the parish, the *size of the church*, the state of the *parsonage-house*, and the *annual worth of the living*, IF UNDER ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY POUNDS! Here was a crafty trick! Why not state the annual worth, if ABOVE one hundred and fifty pounds! Why this close disguise if ABOVE that mark? Is not the answer ready? To have stated the annual worth of the *whole* of the livings would have shown to this beggared people what an immense sum is swallowed annually by these comparatively few men and their families, whose Catholic predecessors kept all the poor, and also kept the churches in repair out of these same tithes. The tithes of England, Wales, and Ireland have been estimated, by several writers at *eight millions a year*. The parsons affect to say that this is an over statement. But, when any public functionary hears his gains over stated, and knows that he is thereby placed before the public in a disadvantageous light, what is his remedy? Why, to *publish an exact account of what he really does receive*. Aye, and this is what the parsons would do, to be sure, if they had it in their power to prove that their gains have been over-rated. For my part, I am convinced, that, if we include the rent of the *parsonage-houses* and *glebes*, the *compulsory offerings* and *fees*, and all the estates of the bishops, chapters, colleges and other foundations, which, though not legally, nor necessarily, engrossed by the church-parsons, are so in *fact*; if we include the whole, I am convinced, that this church-establishment costs this "*enlightened Protestant nation*," more than TWELVE MILLIONS OF POUNDS STERLING A YEAR; and this, too, observe, without including further millions that are required to maintain the POLICE establishment and the TROOPS, which the public papers so frequently exhibit to us as employed in collecting, or in aiding and defending those who are employed in the collecting of tithes! This "*church-property*," as it is called, must, like the debt, not be estimated by the bare amount of *itself*, but, there must be added to this amount, the cost of the *army*, which is required *on account of it*. If we leave this out of our estimate, we shall be as far short of the true mark, as we should be if we were to leave out of the estimate of the custom and excise taxes the amount of the salaries of

the custom-house and excise officers; or as if we were, in our account of the cost of post-chaise hire, to leave out the amount of the sums paid to the post-boy and the ostler. The cost, then, of this establishment is perfectly enormous: and, what is the establishment *worth* to the nation? Is the "service" rendered by this body of persons, called the clergy, *worth* twelve or fifteen millions a-year? Is it worth *one* million? Is it worth *one* pound? Is not the name of "service" wrongly applied in this case? Has not this establishment now been proved, by ample experience, to be injurious, rather than beneficial, to the country? Ought the incomes to be applied to other public purposes? The stating, and shortly remarking on, a few well-known facts, relating to each of the above four classes of "spiritual persons," taking the classes in the order in which they there stand, will enable us to answer these questions; and, if we find the last of these questions to be answered in the affirmative; that is to say, if we find, that these several parcels of public property ought to be applied to other public purposes, there will remain for us to determine only on the *manner* and *degree*, in which it is our duty to petition the King and Parliament to cause the taking away, or alienation, to be made.

29. To begin with the first class, the TITHES and GLEBES, or property now possessed by the common parsons, or parish clergy, it must always be borne in mind, that this property was only so much put into the hands of the priests for the purposes of relieving their indigent parishioners, of showing hospitality to the stranger, of keeping the church in repair, and keeping up its ornaments, and of furnishing a decent maintenance for the parish priests themselves. This was not only the intention of the founders and endowers of parish-livings, but it was the *law of the land* as well as the law or the church. In the first part, paragraph 51, I have shown by a reference to the *canon-law*, that the poor were to have relief out of the tithes. And, to prove beyond all doubt, that this was the *practice* as well as the law, I need only mention an act of the 15. year of Richard II., which provides, that, if the living of the parish be in the hands of any convent, the convent shall always leave in the hands of their vicar, *a part of the income sufficient for the relief of the poor*. Another act, enforcing this act, was passed in the 4. year of Henry IV. So that it is quite clear, that the tithes, glebes, and all the income of every church-living, were to be employed, as far as necessary, in relieving and in otherwise doing good to the poor and the stranger.

30. It is not necessary to say, that the income arising from this class of public property has been wholly diverted from the purposes to which it was, at first, destined, and to which it was, until the "Reformation," as we Protestants call that sad event, fairly applied. Why, therefore, should these par-

cels of property remain any longer, at any rate, in the hands of the present possessors? If they would, even now, do as the Catholic priests did; if they would maintain the poor of their parishes, and would entertain and help all strangers in distress; if they would repair the churches, keep up the ornaments (there are none left, by-the-by); if, in short, they would *put an end to poor-rates and church-rates*, and keep the poor and repair the church, they might still keep the tithes and the glebes and parsonage-houses and gardens. But, if they will do neither of these, what *reason* is there for their having the property? "They have *law* for it." Oh, ay! and the Catholic clergy, and more especially the monks and nuns, had "*law* for it" too, and law a little *older*, at any rate, than the *law* that our parsons have for it. They have law for it till another law come to take this their law away; and what *reason* is there, I again ask, for leaving the property in their possession? What REASON is there that another law should not come to take this their law away!

31. Most monstrously have they always been afraid of questions like this. Most anxious have they always been to keep out of sight the *origin of the poor-rates*. A Hampshire farmer, who had read the "PROTESTANT REFORMATION," told me a few weeks ago, that at a meeting, relative to the poor, lately held at the poor-house in his parish, and at which meeting the parson presided, there was a good deal said about the frightful increase of, and great hardship inflicted by, the poor-rates, of which the parson complained more vehemently than any body else. He (the farmer) took this occasion to ask, in all simplicity, of his reverence, "*how there came to be such a thing as poor-rates in England, and who it was that used to maintain the poor in old times.*" "Well," said I, "and what did he say to you in answer?" "Zay," replied he, "ha did n't zay much; but ha screwed down 's brows, and, looking as black as the very devil, ha zed, that tw'oud be a good deal better if every man wou'd mind 's woan business." This was a pincher indeed! Our parsons know all about the Catholic *claims* to tithes; they know all about the *collection* of tithes; all about *moduses* and *endowments* and the like; they have at their fingers' ends all the history of the "*superstitions* and *idolatrics*" of the Catholic church; but ignorant as horses they appear with regard to the way in which the poor were kept in Catholic times: and I can tell you another thing; namely, that whoever dares to *make any thing public on that subject* is, if they can reach him, sure to feel, in some way or other, the effects of their implacable vengeance: of the truth of which we have the most complete proof in the curious affair of Mr. RUGGLES, to the circumstances of which I have once before merely alluded, but which, in justice to myself as well as my subject, and, which is of still more importance, in justice to the middle and working

classes of my countrymen, I must here fully relate.

32. In the year 1793, DEIGHTON, bookseller, Holborn, published a book in two vols. octavo. with the following title: "*The History of the Poor: their Rights, Duties, and the Laws respecting them: in a Series of Letters.*" By THOMAS RUGGLES, F.A.S., one of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the Counties of Essex and Suffolk." In this work Mr. Ruggles explained the foundation of the right of the poor to a maintenance from the land; he explained the principle on which the Catholic church took charge of the poor; he traced the church-estates, including tithes, glebes, personal tithes and all, back to one and the same source; namely, CHARITY; he insisted, that gifts, out of which the church-property arose, were gifts, not to bishops and priests, or to any religious order, for their own use, but that they were gifts IN TRUST to them for certain purposes, one of which purposes was, *the maintenance of the poor*; and this his doctrine he founded and upheld on the canons of the church, on the writings of the fathers, on the common-law of England, and on the statute-law of England.

33. Having established his doctrine of *gifts in trust*, he proceeded to inquire, whether this doctrine *ought not now to be acted upon*; and he came to the conclusion, *that it ought to be acted upon*; and that, not only the holders of what is still called church-property, but the holders of abbey-lands also, ought, EVEN NOW, to be made to pay annually towards the maintenance of the poor, *a full fourth at least of the net yearly profits of such property*, and this observe, *over and above* the proportion that might be called for from those who held no such property! For he contended, and indeed he proved, that the grants of the Parliament to Henry VIII. did not set aside, nor at all enfeeble, the claim of the poor to their share of the benefit of the gifts in trust; and that, though the claim had lain DORMANT for a long while, it was BY NO MEANS BECOME EXTINCT. In short, he proposed to *revive the claim, to act upon it*, and to call upon all the holders of church-property, whether coming from the Catholic seculars or regulars, whether now held by *clerical or lay persons*, to give up, if it should be wanted by the poor, a fourth part of the net profits of their estates, be they of what nature they might, for, or towards, the maintenance of the poor, and this too *over and above* the rates paid by other people. He proposed in short, that the poor should be maintained out of the church-property, if a fourth of its income would do it, and if it would not, be proposed, *first to take that fourth*, and then to raise in the present manner, and by *general assessment*, whatever might be wanted further.

34. Observe, now, that it was no jacobin, no radical, no republican, who proposed this; but, in the first place, a landowner; in the next place, a justice of the peace in two coun-

ties; in the next place a most loyal gentleman; in the next place, one of the *adorners of the "heaven born" Pitt*; and, lastly, a most zealous Protestant, asserting that the Catholic church had "*rested on fear and superstition*," and that the "*Reformation*," springing up at the "*magic touch of Henry VIII.*," gave rise to a system "*more consonant to the principles of sober piety and good sense*"! A sort of "*piety*" and "*good sense*" that had it seems, Mr. Ruggles, little to do with *charity*, or with an honest execution of "*trusts*"! However, such was the author of this book; such was the maintainer of these doctrines. "And," the reader will exclaim, "*why were the doctrines not acted upon?*" Aye! that is the pith of the story: that is the very thing we are going to see. "See!" the reader will exclaim; "but, what answer was given to Mr. Ruggles?" Alas! reader, no answer was given to poor Mr. Ruggles; but he soon found himself under the necessity of *answering himself*. In short, HE PUBLISHED A SECOND EDITION OF HIS BOOK, LEFT OUT ALL HIS ABOVE-MENTIONED DOCTRINES AND PROPOSALS, AND ALMOST BEGGED PARDON FOR HAVING PUT FORTH THOSE DOCTRINES AND PROPOSALS!

35. "What!" exclaims the honest reader, "an Englishman do this; an English gentleman do such a thing as this"! O, yes! And your "*gentlemen of England*," as that former demagogue and now creeping courtier, Sir Francis Burdett, calls them, have proved to the world, by a long series of acts, that they are, generally speaking, the meanest and most cowardly of all mankind. But, *what was it*, then, that this poor Thomas Ruggles, Esq., this unfortunate justice of the peace for the counties of Essex and Suffolk; *what was it*, that the poor man *left out of his second edition*? We will now see what it was that he *left out*, what words he *ate*, in order to appease the wrath of the parsons; for he expressly says, in the preface to his *second edition*, that "*HIS PRINCIPLES AS A FRIEND TO THE HIERARCHY, HAD BEEN SOMEWHAT CALLED IN QUESTION*," in consequence of his attempt "*to revive the claim of the poor on the revenues of the clergy*." Poor fellow! That was enough for him! He was marked out for vengeance; he evidently saw it; and published his "*second edition*," in order to *save himself*, if possible. And, now let us see *what it was* that the poor, terrified "*esquire*" left out.

36. In the preface to his *first edition*, he is speaking of the monstrous burdens on the land, especially of the poor-rates; and, here he says, that, in his book, he had made an inquiry into the matter. "More especially," says he; and then he goes on in the following words; and, mind, these words that I am now going to copy here, are *left out in the second edition*. The poor "*esquire*" republishes, in the second edition, the preface to the first edition; and, at the end of the *thirteenth para-*

graph of that preface he leaves out, he sinks he eats the words, and every word, of the following passage: "more especially as to that part of the case, which relates to the productiveness and application of those estates which were originally given to the clergy, *in trust for eleemosynary purposes*; but if the laity were to claim from the legislature, that equity which the Court of Chancery would decree on a bill filed in common cases, on complaint of a *cestui que trust*; that the trustees should fulfil those trusts, for the purposes for which the estate was granted; a cry of '*the church is in danger*,' much more serious and distressing would arise throughout the land, than any attempts of the sectaries have occasioned. This also requires the attention of the minister; but the pen of no individual can ever be expected to rouse him to action on this point; nothing but the *public voice* is equal to that effect; such an equitable decree of the legislature, clashing with the interests of *so reverend a portion* of our fellow-subjects." Poor 'squire! He was compelled to eat these words even in his preface! But we are now to see what a dreadful meal, or rather, counter-vomit, he had to undergo, in the work itself.

37. In his 27. letter, first edition, after describing the *origin* of tithes, he speaks of the *practice*, as to the *distribution* of them. The following are his words, which words he *leaves out* in the second edition.—"That such was their origin, is not only the true theory; but, that, in former days, the *practice* flowed in conformity with the principle, has been already proved in the instance of an application from *St. Augustine to Pope Gregory*, with respect to the *distribution of tithes*; from ancient canons of the church, and from other instances, where the *three-fold or four-fold* division of the tithes was directed, as the sees of the bishops were, or were not, endowed. The writings of the fathers also corroborate the proof of this theory, as well as of the practice; and the evidence of those who first held these *fiduciary* estates for the *benefit of the poor and the church*, is evidence of the highest authority, and establishes the most convincing proof. The statute law also proceeded on this idea; or else the legislature looked on the possessions of the ecclesiastics as the property of the kingdom, in the reigns of Richard II. and Henry IV."—Yes! the parsons of *Essex and Suffolk* did not like to hear of any "*division* of the tithes, or any *distribution* of them." They did not like to hear of "*fiduciary* estates"; that is to say, *trust-held* estates. And so the poor 'squire found that his safest way was to swallow all this down again.

38. The next is a still bigger mass for poor 'Squire Ruggles to get back down his throat. He has been, in the sentences immediately preceding what I am now about to quote, speaking of the turbulent times (from Henry V. to Henry VII. and the still more turbulent times in and after this last reign) which caused the

above-mentioned claim of the poor to *lie dormant*. Then he goes on in the words which I am just about to quote, and which words the poor 'squire has wholly *sunk* in his second edition:—"No wonder that" [during the turbulent times, and after the Reformation,] "these claims should have *remained dormant*, but, it by no means follows, as a consequence, that because such rights of charity as these, owing to the rough and unsettled circumstances of the times, were dormant, they *should BECOME EXTINCT*, especially when so large a portion of the revenue still remained to the church; the possessors of which, however charitable in their DOCTRINES, BY DEGREES WITHDREW THE RIGHTFUL AND ACCUSTOMED PROPORTION OF THEIR ESTATES FROM THE REPAIR OF CHURCHES AND THE MAINTENANCE OF THE POOR; and although they still presided in our high court of conscience, and through the ensuing century gave us chancellors, were, notwithstanding, *very careful how they permitted such a claim to be established over the estates of the dissolved monasteries*: knowing that their own possessions were held by the same tenure, given, at first, for the same purposes, and liable to similar trusts."—No wonder that the 'squire's "principles" as a friend to the hierarchy, were somewhat "called in question." No wonder that he was compelled to swallow these words.

39. Having told us, that the *claims*, though they had been dormant, were not *extinguished*, he proceeded to prove, that the right *still existed* in 1793, as good as it was, as complete as it was, in the 12. or 14. century, *never having been weakened by any positive law*. The following is the passage; most excellent it is; and it is unnecessary for me to add, that it was left out of the second edition.—"We all know, that a *claim* to the third or fourth part of the ecclesiastic revenue for the benefit of the poor, is *nearly vanished* in the oblivion of past times; but a *right may remain*, although the use of it has been long neglected. A maxim of law prevails in ecclesiastical rights, *nullum tempus occurrit ecclesiæ*; the poor are a *part* of the church; the possessions of the church are the possessions of the poor; the revenues have been so styled by the fathers of the church; they were *obtained in the name of the poor*, for the love of God: are not the poor, therefore, permitted to claim the benefit of the *same maxim*? Is not that the law of the part, which is the law of the whole? At least there is as much *justice* in the maxim for the one as for the other; therefore, *nullum tempus occurrit pauperibus*. If positive ordinances of the state have not destroyed this right, *no length of time should be allowed to weaken it*. Let those who doubt the truth of these assertions, find, if they can, an *affirmative injunction*, that the church should hold its revenues free and clear of those trusts, for the benefit of the poor, which were created by

the donors, when they gave their lands and tithes for eleemosynary purposes; no such discharge is to be seen in the acts of Parliament in the 27. and 31. Henry VIII., which empowered the crown to alienate the possessions of the monasteries: those, therefore, who are possessed of estates, which were formerly monastic, held them *quod hoc*, subject to the same equitable claim."—Alas! for poor Justice Ruggles! No wonder, good God! that his "principles, as a friend to the hierarchy, were somewhat called in question." However, here we have law, not only equity, but law also, for going with a demand, if we chose it, on the holders of *Abbey-lands* for a part, at least, of their revenues!

40. One more extract shall finish; and, a pretty complete finish it is: for, it contains nothing short of a proposition, to take away from all holders of what is, or what ever was, ecclesiastical property, a full fourth part of the net annual profits of such property! Not a word, not a breath of this, in the squire's second edition! "MUM"! says the squire; but I have found out the first edition; and in that the squire shall now be heard.—"In any future revisal of the laws, respecting the poor, their maintenance, employment, and relief, it may be worth the attention of the legislature to call to mind for what purposes the ecclesiastical revenues of the kingdom were originally granted, to inquire whether they are employed in those purposes; to investigate the fact, on what trusts and on account of what duties, the clergy originally received the clerical estates; and to ask whether those duties and those trusts are now fulfilled; and when they are convinced of the purposes for which those estates were originally granted, and can find no positive law to abrogate those purposes, and perceive that the poor stand as much in need of the performance of those duties, as they did when the estates were first granted to the church; the principle on which the legislature should proceed is manifest. I am aware of the nature of such investigations, and fully sensible that no man can expect, in those whose performances of the duties, for which they have received their estates, is challenged and brought to the test, a favourable audience, nor expect from them a candid interpretation of the motives which instigate to the inquiry; but be that as it may; the present situation of the poor: their wretched state; their increasing misery; the increasing burden upon the public for their maintenance; these warrant the inquiry; the inquiry brings to light the evidence; the deductions are the consequence of a free and candid use of the reasoning faculties; if any error lie either in fact or argument, candour requires an explanation from those who conceive that there is the least intention in the writer to mislead the judgment of the public; which explanation will be thankfully received; as it will, nevertheless, tend to establish one great object of this investigation, that is truth. Assuming,

therefore, the foregoing state of the matter as fact, would it be a hard compromise with the possessors of ecclesiastical estates, that those in the possession of lay patrons, on whom no parochial duty is incumbent, should, after a medium of the poor-rates has been taken throughout the kingdom for the last three years, bear the increased expense of the maintenance of the poor alone, until the rate upon their ecclesiastical estates amount to one-fourth of the net annual receipt of their profits, before the lay estates be further encumbered; and that the clergy should be rated in the same proportion?"—Not one word of all this in the second edition!

IRISH CHURCH.

In the last *Register* there were some errors which, though trifling, it is necessary to correct. The first was at the bottom of page 651, where I said, "but I have before me an account relative to the county of Kilkenny, drawn up in consequence of an order of the House of Lords, and communicated by the Bishop of Ossory, and bearing date in the year 1800"; it should have been the year 1731. I should have said that the statement which I made, with regard to the relative numbers of Catholics and Protestants, and the extraordinary decrease of the latter, in 1800, was drawn up by Mr. TIGHE of Woodstock in KILKENNY. I also stated, at page 658, "that the glebe lands in KILKENNY amounted to 7,000*l.* a year. This includes houses, lands, bishops' lands, and all other church-property. Perhaps I should have told the reader, that the whole expense of the military government in Ireland was, for the last year, 1,065,000*l.*, and that the force altogether in that county amounts to thirty-four thousand men: 24,000 soldiers and 10,000 *Bourbon* police. Instead of taking the whole expense of the army, and placing it to the account of the church, I took a fair proportion, which I estimated at 846,000*l.*

Any gentleman desirous of completing his volumes or set of the *Cobbett Magazine*, may have back numbers by applying at 11, Bolt-court.

From the LONDON GAZETTE,

FRIDAY, JUNE 13, 1834.

INSOLVENTS.

BENNETT, R., Worcester, linen-draper.
 QUELLE, C., Ludgate-hill, furrier.

BANKRUPTS.

BENNS, R., Manchester, grocer.
 GOREN, J., Orchard-street, Portman-square,
 scrivener.
 HARRIS, W., Southampton-street, Covent-
 garden, laceman.
 MATHEWS, J., Tooley-street, Southwark,
 linen-draper.
 PAYNE, H., Rotherham, Yorkshire, grocer.
 PERRY, J., New Sarum, Wiltshire, innkeeper.
 SCOTSON, J., Wigan, Lancashire, druggist.
 WEEDON, T., Southall, Middlesex, vic-
 tualler.
 WILKINSON, W., York, innkeeper.

TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 1834.

INSOLVENTS.

ASHCROFT, T., and J. Tilston, Liverpool,
 timber-merchants.

BANKRUPTS.

ANDERTON, T., Liverpool, merchant.
 ASHLEY, J. B., Hanway-street, Oxford-st.,
 victualler.
 CHAMPION, C., Sheffield, scissor-manufac-
 turer.
 GRIFFITHS, H., Liverpool, builder.
 HOWARD, E. J., Duke-street, Westminster,
 money-scrivener.
 MADDEN, T., Cambridge, hatter.
 POULTER, W., jun., Needham-market, Suf-
 folk, grocer.
 SHANKLIN, T. R., and J. H. Shanklin,
 Birkinhead, Cheshire, brewers.
 WEEKES, J., Lime-street, hide-dealers.
 WOEHRLER, H. R., Ossulston-street, Somers-
 town, victualler.

SCOTCH SEQUESTRATION.

BINGHAM, S., and Co., Paisley, clothiers.

LONDON MARKETS.

MARK-LANE, CORN-EXCHANGE, June 16.—
 We had a good show of samples fresh up to
 this morning's market from the home coun-
 ties. The trade opened with a heavy aspect,
 and the genial rains having been considered
 as generally beneficial to the growing crops,
 checked the ardour of speculators. Holders
 commenced by demanding the rates of last
 week, which millers refusing to accede to,
 sales were eventually effected at a decline on
 the best qualities of full 2s. per quarter on the
 rates of last week, and for other descriptions,

there was hardly any inquiry. In bonded
 Wheat nothing doing.

The supplies of Barley were moderate, and
 the trade ruled dull; speculative inquiry having
 partially subsided, prices, however, remained
 unaltered; a good parcel in bond was offered
 at 16s. Fine parcels of Malt are scarce, and
 maltsters evinced little disposition to realize,
 but the quotations of this day se'nnight could
 not be maintained by 1s. per quarter.

We have been liberally supplied with Oats
 since Friday, and several parcels being left
 over from that day, caused the stands to be
 well filled, particularly with Irish samples.
 Dealers as well as speculators held off from
 purchasing, and the trade was in consequence
 rendered heavy at a decline of fully 1s. per
 quarter from the rates of last Monday, prices
 remaining nearly the same as on Monday. In
 bonded qualities little doing; but holders did
 not lower their demands.

Beans, though in limited supply, were heavy
 in disposal, and full 2s. der quarter cheaper.
 Bonded qualities were offering on lower terms.

Peas extremely scarce, and as the rains
 cannot in many instances cause any improve-
 ment in the crops, prices advanced, and are
 from 1s. to 2s. per quarter dearer on all de-
 scriptions. Bonded samples in demand at
 from 26s. to 30s., and fine, 32s.

Flour steady, with a fair demand, and ship
 marks supported last week's improvement of
 1s. to 2s. per sack.

Wheat, Essex, Kent, and Suffolk	46s. to 52s.
— White	50s. to 57s.
— Norfolk, Lincolnshire, } and Yorkshire.....	43s. to 48s.
— White, ditto	47s. to 53s.
— West Country red.....	44s. to 49s.
— White, ditto	48s. to 52s.
— Northumberland and } Berwickshire red..	40s. to 46s.
— White, ditto	42s. to 48s.
— Moray, Angus, and } Rothshire red.....	31s. to 44s.
— White, ditto	44s. to 46s.
— Irish red	38s. to 42s.
— White, ditto	41s. to 45s.
Barley, Malting	29s. to 31s.
— Chevalier	—s. to 33s.
— Distilling	30s. to 31s.
— Grinding.....	28s. to 30s.
Malt, new.....	37s. to 47s.
— Norfolk, pale.....	50s. to 56s.
— Ware	52s. to 58s.
Peas, Hog and Grey	36s. to 41s.
— Maple	40s. to 43s.
— White Boilers	38s. to 48s.
Beans, Small	33s. to 38s.
— Harrow	33s. to 38s.
— Tick.....	32s. to 35s.
Oats, English Feed	24s. to 26s.
— Short, small	25s. to 27s.
— Poland	24s. to 28s.
— Scotch, common	24s. to 25s.
— — Potato	26s. to 28s.
— — Berwick	25s. to 27s.

— Irish, Galway, &c.	21s. to 23s.
— — Potato	24s. to 26s.
— — Black	24s. to 25s.
Bran, per bushel	10s. to 13s.
Flour, per sack	43s. to 46s.

PROVISIONS.

Butter, Dorset	40s. to —s. per cwt.
— Cambridge	40s. to —s.
— York	40s. to —s.
Cheese, Dble. Gloucester	48s. to 68s.
— Single ditto....	44s. to 48s.
— Cheshire.....	54s. to 78s.
— Derby	50s. to 60s.
Hams, Westmoreland..	50s. to 60s.
— Cumberland ...	46s. to 56s.

SMITHFIELD, June 16.

This day's supply of Sheep, Lambs, and Calves, was rather great; its supply of Beasts and Porkers but limited. With prime small Beef, Mutton, and Lamb, trade was somewhat brisk, the middling and inferior kinds, as also with Veal and Pork, very dull, at barely Friday's quotations.

A full moiety of the Beasts were Short-horns, a fourth of them Scots, and the remaining fourth about equal numbers of Devons, Welsh runts, and Irish Beasts, with a few Herefords, Sussex Beasts, and Town's-end Cows, &c.

At least three-fifths of the Sheep were new Leicesters of the South Down and white-faced crosses, in the proportion of about two of the former to five of the latter; about a fifth South Downs; and the remaining fifth about equal numbers of old Leicesters, Kents, and Kentish half-breds, and horned and polled Norfolks, with a few pens of horned Dorsets and Somersets, horned and polled Scotch and Welsh Sheep, &c.

Full two-thirds of the Lambs, which were said to number in the whole about 6,500, were Southdowns; and the remaining third about equal numbers of new Leicesters of various crosses, and Dorsets, with a few pens of Kentish half-breds, and sundry other incidental crosses.

About 1,400 of the Beasts, about 500 of which were Scots, the remainder about equal numbers of Short-horns, Devons, and Welsh runts, with a few homebreds, came from Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, and Cambridgeshire; about 470, a full moiety of which were Short-horns, the remainder about equal numbers of Devons, Welsh runts, and Irish, with a few Herefordshire beasts, were from Lincolnshire, Leicestershire, &c.; about 90, mostly polled Scots, by steamers from Scotland; about 120, chiefly Devons, with a few Herefords, runts, and Irish beasts, from our western and midland districts; about 80, about a fourth of which were Sussex beasts, the remainder about equal numbers of Devons, runts, and Irish beasts, from Kent, Sussex, and Surrey; and most of the remainder, including the Town's-end cows, from the neighbourhood of London.

COBBETT-LIBRARY.

Fourth Edition.

COBBETT'S Spelling-Book.

(Price 2s.)

Containing, besides all the usual matter of such a book, a clear and concise

INTRODUCTION TO ENGLISH GRAMMAR.

This I have written by way of

A Stepping-Stone to my own Grammar;

such a thing having been frequently suggested to me by Teachers as necessary.

1. ENGLISH GRAMMAR.—Of this work one hundred thousand copies have now been published. This is a duodecimo volume, and the price is 3s. bound in boards.

2. TULL'S HORSE-HOEING HUSBANDRY; or, a Treatise on the Principles of Tillage and Vegetation. With an Introduction, by WM. COBBETT. 8vo. Price 15s.

3. THE EMIGRANT'S GUIDE. Just now Published, under this Title, a little Volume, containing Ten Letters, addressed to English Tax-payers. A new edition, with a Postscript, containing an account of the Prices of Houses and Land, recently obtained from America by Mr. Cobbett. Price 2s. 6d. in bds.

4. THE WOODLANDS; or, a Treatise on the preparing of the ground for planting; on the planting, on the cultivating, on the pruning, and on the cutting down, of Forest Trees and Underwoods. Price 14s. bound in boards.

5. YEAR'S RESIDENCE IN AMERICA.—The Price of this book, in good print and on fine paper, is 5s.

6. FRENCH GRAMMAR; or, Plain Instructions for the Learning of French. Price, bound in boards, 5s.

7. COTTAGE ECONOMY.—I wrote this Work professedly for the use of the labouring and middling classes of the English nation. I made myself acquainted with the best and simplest modes of making beer and bread, and these I made it as plain as, I believe, words could make it. Also of the keeping of Cows, Pigs, Bees, and Poultry, matters which I understood as well as any body could, and in all their details. It includes my writing, also on the Straw Plait. A Duodecimo Volume. Price 2s. 6d.

8. MARTENS'S LAW OF NATIONS.—This is the Book which was the foundation of all the knowledge that I have ever possessed relative to public law. The Price is 17s., and the manner of its execution is I think, such as to make it fit for the Library of any Gentleman.

9. MR. JAMES PAUL COBBETT'S
RIDE OF EIGHT HUNDRED MILES IN
FRANCE. Second Edition. Price 2s. 6d.

10. A TREATISE ON COBBETT'S
CORN; containing Instructions for Propa-
gating and Cultivating the Plant, and for
Harvesting and Preserving the Crop; and also
an account of the several uses to which the
Produce is applied. Price 5s.

11. LETTERS FROM FRANCE;
containing Observations made in that Country
during a Residence of Two Months in the
South, and Three Months at Paris. By JOHN
M. COBBETT. Price 4s. in boards.

12. PROTESTANT "REFORMA-
TION" in England and Ireland, showing how
that event has impoverished and degraded the
main body of the people in those countries
Two volumes, bound in boards. The Price of
the first volume is 4s. 6d. The Price of the
second volume 3s. 6d.

13. SERMONS.—There are twelve of
these, in one volume, on the following sub-
jects: 1. Hypocrisy and Cruelty; 2. Drunken-
ness; 3. Bribery; 4. Oppression; 5. Unjust
Judges; 6. The Sluggard; 7. The Murderer;
8. The Gamester; 9. Public Robbery; 10. The
Unnatural Mother; 11. The Sin of Forbidding
Marriage; 12. On the Duties of Parsons, and
on the Institution and Object of Tithes. Price
3s. 6d. bound in boards.

A Thirteenth Sermon, entitled "GOOD
FRIDAY; or, The Murder of Jesus Christ by
the Jews." Price 6d.

Just published,

PRACTICAL EXERCISES:

WITH

**A KEY TO COBBETT'S FRENCH
GRAMMAR.**

By J. P. Cobbett. Price Two Shillings.

**A NEW
FRENCH AND ENGLISH
DICTIONARY.**

In two parts. Part I. French and English.—
Part II. English and French. By WILLIAM
COBBETT, M.P. for Oldham.

Just Published,

THE

LIFE OF GENERAL JACKSON,

President of America: with an interesting
frontispiece; and an exact likeness of the
President. Price 3s. 6d.

Just published, price 4d.,

NATIONAL REGENERATION.

1. Letter from Mr. Fitton to Mr. Fielden.
2. Letter from Mr. Fielden to Mr. Fitton.
3. Letter from Mr. Holt to Mr. Fielden.

Which Letters contain a development of all
the principles and all the views connected
with this important change in the manufac-
turing affairs of the country.

CHEAP CLOTHING!!

SWAIN AND CO., Tailors, &c.,

93, FLEET-STREET,

(Near New Bridge-street.)

BEg the attention of the public to their
extensive stock of goods for the present
season, which they supply at the following
prices:—

FOR CASH ONLY.

	£.	s.	d.
A Suit of Superfine Clothes.....	4	18	0
Ditto, Black or Blue.....	5	10	0
Ditto, Imperial Saxony.....	6	0	0
Petersham Great Coats.....	3	3	0
Barogan or Velveteen Shooting Jackets.....	1	10	0
Cobbett's Cord Trowsers.....	1	2	0
A complete Suit of Livery.....	4	10	0
SPANISH, OPERA, and WALKING CLOAKS, LADIES' HABITS AND PELISSES, and CHIL- DREN'S DRESSES, and every other article in the trade made in the most elegant manner.			

I recommend Messrs. Swain and Co.
as very good and punctual tradesmen,
whom I have long employed with great
satisfaction. Wm. COBBETT.

**CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF
ENGLAND.**

In Octavo 14s. boards.

THEORY OF THE CONSTITUTION,
from the earliest period to the present
time.—By James B. Bernard, Esq., Fellow of
King's College, Cambridge.

Blackwood's Magazine, noticing the above
work, says, "His book is truly a work of
genius; his views of the changes of the
constitution, though sometimes exaggerated,
are always original, generally just and pro-
found", and Cobbett's Magazine pronounces
it "one of the best works on the subjects
treated in it, we ever read." Numerous other
favourable notices might be cited.

James Ridgway and Sons, Piccadilly; Bell
and Bradfute, Edinburgh; and all Booksel-
lers.

Printed by William Cobbett, Johnson's-court; and
published by him, at 11, Bolt-court, Fleet-street.